

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

Vol 11 41

MAGAZINE FOR A DEMOCRACY OF CONTENT

MAY-JUNE 1961

"Dr. Zhivago" and the Russian Revolution

F. Lohenbill

Problems of Russian Agriculture

E. Delimars

France: Portrait of Autocracy in Action

Paul Ecker

*World Plan for the Solution of
Modern Society's Economic and
Social Crisis "—an introduction"*

Report on the Cameroons

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

No. 40

CONTENTS

Rubicon For the Negro South	Paul Ecker
On the "Inner Limit" of Capitalism	Ernst Zander
Ideological Elements in The New Criticism	Alan Dutscher
Effective Protest versus Empty Words	Paul Ecker
Extracts From an Interview with Jacques Tati	

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES is not conducted as a profit-making concern, but is a voluntary enterprise in which editorial work is done, and articles contributed, without payment. Readers are asked to help in this effort to assure regular production of a magazine of quality by submitting articles, reports, comments and by giving financial help. Friends of *Contemporary Issues* hold regular discussion meetings, and anyone interested in taking part in them is asked to write to our London or New York address.

Published by Contemporary Press, 37 Penton Str., London, N.1
(Mail Only) and 545 Fifth Avenue, New York City 17, N.Y.

Subscription rates are 10s. (\$1.80) for four numbers.

Also distributed throughout the U.S.A. by Selected Outlets,
102 Beverley Road, Bloomfield, N.J.

F. Lohenbill

“DR. ZHIVAGO” AND THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

When he wrote his novel *Dr. Zhivago*, Boris Pasternak must have assumed that it would be published in Russia, for it is unmistakably written with an eye to the Russian censor. All the characters in it who take part in the action are fictitious, and it is only through its influence on the fate of these fictitious people that one can follow the course of the historical events. This notwithstanding, Pasternak has found it possible to convey a deeply tragic picture of the Russian Revolution from its early beginnings in 1905. Moreover, he not only gives a reconstruction of the events disguised in the form of a novel; but also tries to give a critical explanation of the Revolution.

In what follows, we shall, without going into the literary merits of the novel as such, trace Dr. Zhivago's ideological development step by step and thereby subject Pasternak's attitude to the Revolution to critical evaluation.

Zhivago hails the beginning of the Revolution with enthusiasm: “We are free—not just free, in theory, in words—it's real freedom. . . .” But his first enthusiasm was not without doubts and reservations, for his enthusiasm for the Revolution was “. . . in the sense in which it was accepted by the middle classes and in which it had been understood by the students, followers of Blok, in 1905”. “It would be good to go back to that climate, once the war was over, to see its renewal and continuation. . . .”

This return was never to take place. The war had brought about a change which meant a definitive break with the past. New things had entered into the consciousness of Zhivago. “These new things were not familiar, not led up to by the old; they were unchosen, prescribed by reality and as sudden as an earthquake. Among them was the war with its bloodshed and its horrors. . . . Such a new thing, too, was the revolution, not the one idealised in student fashion in 1905, but this new upheaval, today's, born of the war, bloody, pitiless, elemental, the soldiers' revolution led by the professionals, the bolsheviks.”

When he reads in a special edition of a newspaper that the bolsheviks have taken power, he is nevertheless “shaken and overwhelmed by the greatness of the moment and the thought of its significance for centuries to come”.

“. . . Quite simply, without any nonsense, you take the old monster of injustice which has been accustomed for centuries to being bowed and scraped and curtsayed to, and you sentence it to death.

"This fearlessness, this way of seeing the thing through to the end, has a familiar national look about it. It has something of Pushkin's blazing directness and of Tolstoy's bold attachment to the facts. . . .

"And the real stroke of genius is this: Suppose you told someone to go and create a new world, to start a new era. . . . They would wait for the old centuries to finish before they started to build the new one. . . .

"But here, they don't bother with anything like that—'Here it is. Take it or leave it.' This new thing, this marvel of history, this revelation is exploded right into the very thick of daily life without the slightest consideration for its course. . . . That's real genius. Only real greatness can be so misplaced and so untimely."

With only a few strokes of the pen, Pasternak paints a graphic picture of the fearful privations Russia had to suffer during the years of the Revolution:

"Winter came, just the kind of winter that had been foretold. It was not as terrifying as the two winters that followed it but it was already of the same sort, dark, hungry and cold, spent in watching the destruction of all that was familiar and the changing of all the foundations of life, and in inhuman efforts to keep hold of life as it slipped out of your grasp."

Zhivago endures all these privations and dreadful changes, and, in contradistinction to the majority of his colleagues who turn against the new régime and sabotage it, works heroically and in the most difficult conditions, as a doctor in a hospital. Only under pressure from his family, for whom the material conditions in Moscow had become unbearable, does he finally decide to leave Moscow and travel to Varykino.

The long and adventurous journey to Varykino gives Pasternak the opportunity to unroll before the reader's eyes the whole panorama of the civil war. It is also the decisive turning point in Zhivago's attitude toward the Revolution. Already the make-up of the train teaches him a very hard lesson. In the front coaches travel the revolutionary sailors who, according to Pasternak, lord it over everything like demigods; they are exempt from all the duties which fall to the lot of the passengers on the long journey; in a few trucks in the middle are the private travellers; whereas the remaining and greatest number of trucks is full of political prisoners. Most of these prisoners are of the poor—miserable creatures who, deprived of all hope, have accepted their fate, whereas black marketeers, lawyers and people of social standing, calculate on their early release, owing to their many connections. The private passengers mostly travel together with prisoners, as the prison trucks are packed.

Zhivago, who had become acquainted with the misery in the towns, believed that the Revolution had bettered the peasants' lot. The co-operativist, Kostoyed, however, corrects him:

"When the revolution came and woke him [the peasant] up, he decided that this was the fulfilment of his dream, his ancient dream of living anarchically on his own land by the work of his hands, in

complete independence and without owing anything to anyone. Instead of that, he found he had only exchanged the old oppression of the tsarist state for the new, much harsher yoke of the revolutionary super-state."

Zhivago refuses to accept this view as the true one. He rejects it with the despairing cry: "It's true that I want to believe that the peasants are better off and the villages prosperous.—If I can't believe that, then what am I to do? Who am I to believe, what am I to live by?"

Zhivago is nonetheless not allowed to harbour his illusions for very long. The farther the train penetrates into the interior of Russia, the more clearly does he see that the co-operativist has spoken the truth.

The train passes by burnt-down villages, villages which have been machine-gunned by the Reds.

" 'Why? What had you done?

'We didn't do anything, it was our neighbours, but we got punished for good measure. . . .

'And what crimes had they committed?

'Pretty well all the seven deadly sins. Dissolved their Poor Peasants' Committee, that's one, refused to supply horses to the Red Army, that's two . . . resisted the mobilisation decree—that makes three at any rate.' "

The following conversation could be heard at a later stop, near a village from which there came a great uproar:

" 'Well, have they had their tails twisted yet? Are they keeping quiet now?

'The shopkeepers, you mean?

'Yes, the corn-dealers.

'Feed out of your hand! As soon as a few were bumped off by way of example, all the others became as good as gold. A fine has been imposed on the district.

'How much?

'Forty thousand puds.' "

Even before his arrival at Varykino, Zhivago has lost all his illusions.

" . . . Marxism is not sufficiently master of itself to be a science. Science is more balanced. You talk about Marxism and objectivity. I don't know any teaching more self-centred and further from the facts than Marxism. Ordinarily, people are anxious to test their theories in practice, to learn from experience, but those who wield power are so anxious to establish the myth of their own infallibility that they turn their back on truth as squarely as they can . . . " says Zhivago in a conversation with the very human Samdevyatov who is later in his life to appear very often as his guardian angel. Or in a later conversation with him:

" " . . . You are a Bolshevik, and yet even you admit that what's going on isn't life—it's lunacy, it's an absurd nightmare.

'Of course I do. But don't you see that it's a matter of historical inevitability . . . ?

'Where is the inevitability?

'Are you a child? . . . Gluttons and parasites sat on the backs of the starving workers and drove them to death, and you imagine things could stay like that? . . .

' . . . I used to be very revolutionary-minded, but now I think that nothing can be gained by violence. People must be drawn to good by goodness. . . .'

For Zhivago, the Revolution has now lost all sense. Varykino, to which he had originally gone only with reluctance, now becomes a welcome haven of peace. The primitive self-sufficient existence in the country where, in defiance of the State laws then obtaining, he "illegally" works a small plot of land on the former estate of his father-in-law, suits him. Here he finds physical activity and the time to meditate. All the same, he does not consider the private solution of his problem a model to be followed by everyone: ". . . I am not preaching a Tolstoyan doctrine of simplicity and 'back to the land'". Moreover, he considers his passivity and his aloofness from events in Russia as in no way constructive, and tries to justify himself in his own eyes:

"What is it that prevents me from being useful as a doctor or a writer? I think it is not so much our privations . . . as the power in our day of rhetoric, of the cliché—all this 'dawn of the future', 'building a new world', 'torchbearers of mankind' . . . the reason it is so pompous is that there is no imagination at the back of it, because the thought is second-rate."

To the objection that he used to talk with more equanimity about the Revolution, he answers: ". . . there are limits to everything. In all this time something definite should have been achieved. But it turns out that those who inspired the revolution aren't at home in anything except change and turmoil. . . . For them, transitional periods, worlds in the making, are an end in themselves. . . . It's because they haven't any real capacities, they are ungifted. Man is born to live, not to prepare for life. . . . Why substitute this childish harlequinade of adolescent fantasies, these schoolboy escapades? . . .

"It's only in bad novels that people are divided into two camps and have nothing to do with each other. In real life everything gets mixed up! Don't you think you'd have to be a hopeless nonentity to play only one rôle all your life, to have only one place in society, always to stand for the same thing? . . ."

*

*

*

Zhivago's idyllic family life at Varykino comes to a sudden end with his capture and forced mobilisation. He becomes a "red" partisan doctor, but for him there no longer exists either "white" or "red". He sees only an indescribable human tragedy and, on both sides, only unbelievable narrow-mindedness, horrible bloodshed and the most bestial cruelties.

Old revolutionaries, workers, who already in 1905 had played heroic roles, are to him by this time no more than brutal tyrants.

"... The people who were lording it in Khodatskoye nowadays ... they were former political exiles from the capitals. ... They were cunning and they knew their own minds, they had stirred up plenty of trouble in their day, they were sure to be plotting something again now. They couldn't live unless they were up to something. They had spent their lives dealing with machines and they were cold and merciless as machines themselves. ..."

Zhivago now stands so aloof from events that, during a battle with the whites, he can commit the "deadly sin" of hiding a young wounded white guard, nursing him back to health and letting him escape, although the young man left him in no doubt that he would go on fighting on the side of the whites. "It was a time when savagery was at its height. Prisoners did not reach headquarters alive and enemy wounded were knifed in the field."

This is also the time at which Zhivago says:

"... The idea of social betterment as it is understood since the October Revolution doesn't fill me with enthusiasm ... it is so far from being put into practice, and the mere talk about it has cost such a sea of blood, that I am not at all sure if the end justifies the means. And lastly, and above all, when I hear people speak of reshaping life it makes me lose my self-control and I fall into despair.

"Reshaping life! People who can say that have never understood a thing about life—they have never felt its breath, its heart—however much they have seen or done. They look on it as a lump of raw material which needs to be processed by them, to be ennobled by their touch. ... Life is the principle of self-renewal, it is constantly renewing and remaking and changing and transfiguring itself. ..."

Zhivago's time with the partisans ends with his escape from their camp. He is driven to this by worry about his family, and by rumours of unheard-of brutalities committed by whites at Varykino and its surroundings. The return to Varykino could be effected only on foot.

"For almost half his journey on foot across Siberia he had followed the railway track, all of it out of action, neglected and covered with snow. Train after train, abandoned by the whites, stood idle, stopped by the defeat of Kolchak, by running out of fuel and by snowdrifts. Immobilised for good and buried in the snow they stretched almost uninterruptedly for miles on end. Some of them served as fortresses for armed bands of robbers or as hide-outs for escaping criminals or political fugitives—the involuntary vagrants of those days—but most of them were communal mortuaries, mass graves of victims of the cold and of the typhus raging all along the railway line and mowing down whole villages in its neighbourhood.

"In those days it was true, if ever, that 'man is a wolf to man'. Traveller turned off the road at the sight of traveller, stranger meeting stranger killed for fear of being killed. There were isolated cases of cannibalism. The laws of human civilisation were suspended."

The further story of Zhivago is the typical story of a man who does not want to accept the new Russian reality and cannot adapt himself to it. In the days of the civil war, not to work was, for a man

of Zhivago's background, especially if he were a doctor, to court death. He finds work in a local hospital; but again there, cannot escape the difficulties.

"... It looks as if I'll be forced to resign from my job. It's always the same thing—it happens again and again. At first everything is splendid: 'Come along. We welcome good, honest work, we welcome ideas, especially new ideas. . . .' Then you find in practice that what they mean by ideas is nothing but words—claptrap in praise of the revolution and the régime. I'm sick and tired of it. . . ."

*

*

*

The preceding passages are an almost complete rehearsal of Pasternak's ideas about the Russian Revolution. It is astonishing that Pasternak should show so little political understanding of the circumstances he is capable of describing with so much feeling. In the novel, Pasternak himself remarks that the Revolution had, for Russia, been of the nature of an unavoidable natural catastrophe; but in contradiction to this, he shows himself not satisfied with the acceptance of unavoidable facts; instead, he measures with a moral yardstick what lies beyond both good and evil and the power of a single individual. If social antagonisms in Russia had reached such a pitch that the tension could only be overcome by revolution, then it is idle theory to say that violence breeds nothing but evil. Maxims with pretensions to universality, such as these, which condemn natural phenomena with moral indignation, can nonetheless not do away with hard facts. Pasternak's categorical rejection of all violence is not merely an emotional reaction against the violence of the Stalin régime; it also determines his attitude toward the Russian Revolution. He condemns violence just at the point at which it is the expression of the organised will of the people against absolutism and reaction. He does not differentiate between the early phase of the Revolution and the subsequent Stalinist degeneration. He condemns the coercive measures which the Russian revolutionaries (who were of a consequence and directness paralleled only in the Great French Revolution) were compelled to introduce in the early stages of the Revolution. Whereas the French Revolution smashed feudalism and paved the way for bourgeois development, the Russian Revolution aimed at the abolition of all private property in the means of production. However, the planned transformation of the nationalised means of production into communal ones could not come about owing to the backwardness of Russian conditions. Nationalisation became on the contrary the starting point of a retrogressive development on a modern basis.

The expropriation of the capitalists did not lead to the abolition of capitalism but made really possible in Russia its further development, which was no longer achievable in the traditional liberal-capitalist form, owing to the saturation of the markets. With the liquidation of the old revolutionaries and the setting up of Stalin's totalitarian rule, the counter-revolution in Russia had silently been accomplished.

Of the initial aspirations of the Revolution nothing remained. All

apparently progressive aspects transformed themselves early on into the opposite of what they originally were meant to be. The "dictatorship of the proletariat", the supposedly most democratic form of government, revealed itself to be the most tyrannical totalitarian dictatorship, and the economic progress, allegedly represented by the nationalisation of industry and agriculture, showed itself to be the most brutal and comprehensive form of economic enslavement of the Russian people.

The nationalised means of production formed the basis of Stalin's plan barbarism, whereby the industrialisation of the country was effected by means of the sufferings, deprivations and actual physical annihilation of millions of people. The "capital-ising" of backward countries by means of such indescribable sacrifices is, in the midst of the enormous wealth of the advanced countries, an absurd anachronism. Terroristic figures such as Stalin and Mao-tse-Tung are the true reflection of a world choked by its riches which it does not know how to employ usefully.

In his book, Pasternak knows nothing of the factually accomplished counter-revolution in Russia. The Stalin period is, according to him, an unavoidable episode in the unbroken continuity of the progressing revolution. This opinion he shares with the experts on Russia known as "Sovietologists", who in this manner mislead the public and put obstacles in the way of a true understanding of the situation in Russia. Even the "non-violent" Pasternak becomes an apologist for Stalin's terroristic rule, when he insists on calling it "revolutionary" and henceforth speaks of the subsidiary, fruitful results of this "revolution". Conditions in Russia have certainly improved. But the idea that Russia could now, under the banner of Khrushchev, enter upon the millenium, is a dangerous self-deception. Russia, in spite of sputniks, moon-satellites and hydrogen bombs, is still very backward. The atom and rocket lunacy is not an expression of Russian progressiveness, but reveals only the capitalist character of the Russian economy. This country, economically still poor, wastes the fruit of its labour on sham production in which it zealously competes with America. Contrary to all propaganda, it is precisely the life-destroying wonders of American chemistry and technique which the Russian rulers aspire to emulate, as was once more made clear during Khrushchev's visit to America.

Pasternak's criticism of the Russian revolutionaries is essentially limited to psychological value judgments. He heaps reproaches on them which are without any foundation. The Russian revolutionaries were an intellectual élite, such as had rarely existed in Russia. Pasternak denies them all talent, ability and originality, although Lenin, one of the greatest thinkers of our century, was one of them. Nonetheless, "lack of originality" is no argument. The value of an idea lies not in its "originality" but in its correctness and adequacy relative to a desired end. When Pasternak becomes "concrete" in his criticism, he is vague. Whilst the civil war is still raging, he demands "tangible results", and deplores the lack of an amelioration of social

conditions. In reality, however, one cannot reproach the Revolution "with not having achieved anything", for it laid the foundations for a progressive development in all spheres of social life. Only a dreamer could, after a bloody war and a still bloodier civil war, expect from the economy which was at its lowest ebb an immediate solution to the material problems. Slogans such as "building of a new world", and "dawn of new times to come", however monotonous and hackneyed, were not merely hollow phrases. They were the expression of one of the greatest and most consequent of revolutions. This, however, lies already beyond the sphere of Pasternak's interest. He dismisses such ideas with the argument that it is nonsense to talk of "reshaping life". In reality, Pasternak's profound social philosophy expresses merely the idea that it is impossible and temerarious to wish to change existing social conditions. This conception is in contradiction to Pasternak's own attitude. With his novel he himself seriously "interfered" with the social conditions of Russia, and had to feel the consequences on his own skin.

*

*

*

Pasternak's book ends with the civil war. The short conclusion and epilogue bring us from the period of the NEP into present-day Russia. In these last chapters his criticism is daring and courageous. To give but an example, he lets one of Zhivago's best friends talk about his conversion after his deportation, and comments:

"... Men who are not free ... always idealise their bondage. So it was in the Middle Ages, and the Jesuits always played on this. Yury could not bear the political mysticism of the Soviet intelligentsia. ... 'The great majority of us are required to live a life of constant, systematic duplicity. ... I found it painful to listen to you, Nicky, when you told us how you were re-educated and grew up in jail. It was like listening to a circus horse describing how it broke itself in.'"

The epilogue gives a short description of slave labour in the ice wastes of Siberia. Pasternak describes how the slave-labour camps were built from nothing by the prisoners with their bare hands.

In this epilogue he also talks of the liberating effects of the war.

"... The war came as a breath of fresh air, an omen of deliverance, a purifying storm. ... Collectivisation was both a mistake and a failure, and because it couldn't be admitted, every means of intimidation had to be used to make people forget how to think and judge for themselves, to force them to see what wasn't there, and to maintain the contrary of what their eyes told them. ... And when the war broke out, its real horrors, its real dangers, its menace of real death, were a blessing compared with the inhuman power of the lie, a relief because it broke the spell of the dead letter. It was not only felt by men in your position, in concentration camps, but by everyone without exception, at home and at the front. ..."

Notwithstanding the terror which Pasternak described, his book ends on an optimistic note:

"The war has its special character as a link in the chain of revolutionary decades. It marks the end of the direct action of the causes inherent in the nature of the upheaval itself. By now, secondary causes are at work; we are seeing the fruit of its fruit, the results of its results—characters tempered by misfortune, unspoilt, heroic, ready for great, desperate, unheard-of deeds. These fabulous, astounding qualities are the moral flowering of this generation."

And further:

"Although the enlightenment and liberation which had been expected to come after the war had not come with victory, a presage of freedom was in the air throughout these post-war years, and it was their only historical meaning."



The easing up of conditions which started with Khrushchev's policy of liberalisation probably reinforced Pasternak's belief that the time had come to publish the novel. But the régime was not yet ready. Under Stalin, he would probably have been exiled or even shot for daring to submit such a work. In contradistinction to this, the Writers' Union was, to begin with, astonishingly reticent. In a fairly pertinent letter, it took the following position:

"The *leitmotif* of your novel is the view that the October revolution, the civil war and connected social changes brought the people nothing but suffering and destroyed the Russian intelligentsia physically or morally. The writer's interpretation of the past of our country, and above all of the first decade after the October revolution, as it emerges from the pages of the novel, indicates that the October revolution was a mistake and that everything that followed therefrom has been evil."

This evaluation of Pasternak's point of view is almost correct, but for one objection. Pasternak's attitude toward the Revolution is not as clear and unequivocal as this. On the one hand he sees it as a necessary evil, while on the other he believes that with the passing of the Stalin period a new epoch has begun in which the material aspirations of the people will at last be realised. Pasternak came out of his conflict with the Writers' Union amazingly well. To judge from the Press, his entire rehabilitation is only a matter of time. This shows to what a degree the monolithic character of the Russian State has been broken. Khrushchev apparently defended Pasternak on a number of occasions against the Writers' Union. The French newspaper *Le Figaro* reports even that Khrushchev, after a reading of *Dr. Zhivago*, reproached the Writers' Union with having made too much fuss "about such an excellent book". It is astonishing that the official writers, in spite of their formal objectivity in discussion with Pasternak, did not try even once to pose as the orthodox defenders of the Revolution by making a detailed analysis of the novel. The reason for this surely lies in the fact that also in matters of *ideology*, everything is now in flux in Russia. The time is probably not very distant when the Russian rulers, like once the French bourgeoisie,

will adopt a more "aloof" and "objective" attitude to the Revolution. In such an event, Pasternak could play a very useful rôle as ideologist. His ideas might help to fill the ideological vacuum which would be created by a renunciation of the now already very threadbare phrases about the Revolution. It already pleases Khrushchev to compare Stalin with "Peter the Great", and to talk of the era of Stalin's government as an historically unavoidable epoch. Will Khrushchev's epoch be one of "enlightened barbarism", in which ultimately also novels like *Dr. Zhivago* will find a place?

(*This article was written before the death of Pasternak.*)

February, 1960.

E. Delimars

PROBLEMS OF RUSSIAN AGRICULTURE*

The seven-year plan adopted by the XXIst Congress of the C.P. of the U.S.S.R. proposes to raise the total harvest of cereals by 1965 to 10-11 milliard *puds* (164-180 million tons). It also proposes to double present meat production, raising it to 16 million tons, almost to double the production of milk, to increase the number of head of cattle 3.2 times, considerably to expand mechanised agriculture and market-gardening, etc.

These aims are not new: the Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P., convened in January, 1955, already envisaged a cereal harvest of at least 10 milliard *puds* for 1960, and the XXth Party Congress in February, 1956, emphasised the necessity of reaching 11 milliard *puds* by 1960,¹ of doubling the 1955 meat production, etc.²

At present (July, 1959), this same harvest of 10-11 milliard *puds* is anticipated only for 1965. Russian agriculture has, in fact, for several years been struggling with difficulties which have kept its development below the level of these optimistic forecasts.

* This article first appeared in the French periodical *Le Contrat Social* (No. 4, July, 1959), and is translated by permission of the author.

1. *Great Soviet Encyclopædia (GSE)*, 2nd edition, Vol. 50, page 316.

2. *Ibid.*, Vol. 50, page 319.

It is true that from 1943 to 1958 the total cereal yield rose from 5,306 to 8,508 million *puds*, but this progress "is chiefly due to the bringing into production in 1954-58 of 35 million hectares of virgin lands",³ according to Khrushchev's admission at the December, 1958, Plenum. As no appreciable extension of the virgin lands' scheme is envisaged for 1959-65, it is therefore a matter of increasing the cereal harvest by two to three milliard *puds* on an acreage almost equal to that of 1958. In these circumstances, the working of the difficulties which put a brake on agricultural development will make itself increasingly felt, and it is proper to ask whether the targets of the seven-year plan will in fact be reached by 1965.

The Manpower Crisis

What are the handicaps facing Soviet agriculture today? The first and major obstacle appears to be one Soviet sources pass over in silence, and which is only very rarely mentioned in the West: the depopulation of the countryside and the lack of manpower in agriculture and stock-breeding.

In fact, the normal growth of population in Russia has been seriously interfered with a number of times during the past 45 years with consequences that today gravely affect manpower in general, and manpower in agriculture in particular.

The age of the working population in the U.S.S.R. ranges from 18 to 60.⁴ The strength of these 42 age-groups reflects the gaps caused by the following factors:

1. The first World War,⁵ during which Russia lost more than 820,000 men who were killed, died of injuries or disappeared. To this must be added 2,650,000 prisoners.⁶ The 1917 census of the rural population shows that available, able-bodied manpower had fallen by 47.4 per cent in the country.⁷ Losses, coupled with the absence of prisoners, caused a heavy fall in the birthrate, which fell even more during the years which followed.

2. In 1918-20, the revolution, civil war, the war against Poland, etc., caused the death of nearly 8,000,000 persons, exclusive of normal mortality.⁸ Thus in Moscow, for the year 1920, the number of births reached only 58.9 per cent of the number of deaths.⁹

3. *Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P. of the U.S.S.R., 15-19 December, 1958, shorthand report*, Moscow, December, 1958, pages 14-15. This volume will farther on be referred to as: *Short. Rep.*

4. Old-age pensions are paid to men at the age of 60, and to women at the age of 55.

5. In Russia, the October revolution (7th November, 1917) in effect brought this war to an end, independently of any "declared peace".

6. Figures as on 1st February, 1917. Cf. *GSE*, Vol. 50, page 203.

7. *GSE*, Vol. 50, page 202.

8. From a study by Dr. Biraben, "Essay on the demographic evolution of the U.S.S.R.," *Population*, No. 2b (June, 1958), Paris, page 38.

9. *GSE*, 1st edition, Vol. "U.S.S.R.," page 50.

In addition, the famine of the winter of 1921-22 and spring of 1922 killed almost 5,000,000 persons, and a further 2,000,000 emigrated.¹⁰

It is only as from 1923 that life became more or less normal again. The growth of population was resumed and continued until 1930. This was, however, due more to the fall in the death-rate than to the rise in the birthrate.

3. After this partial improvement, the collectivisation of agriculture and the brutal liquidation of the "kulaks" resulted in a drop in the birthrate and a sharp rise in the death-rate. During the winter of 1932-33, famine stalked the Ukraine, the Caucasus, the Lower and Middle Volga, the Kazakhstan and part of Siberia. The following winter was harder still: some 6,000,000 people died of hunger. The harshness of living conditions caused such a sharp increase in the number of abortions, that the Government was forced to forbid them in 1936, in order to bring the birthrate back to its normal level, something achieved in Russia only in 1937-38.

4. A new period of declining population opened in 1939, for the Finnish War and the arrival at marriageable age of the shrunken generation of 1914-18, caused a further drop in the birthrate.¹¹ "In 1940, after the annexation of Western Ukraine, of Byelorussia and of the three Baltic republics, the population reached a figure of only 191.7 million, whereas Tsarist Russia had a population of 159.2 million in 1913."¹² Thus, in 27 years, the population rose by only 32.5 million, that is, an average of 1.2 million per annum. Now, "the normal growth of population amounted to 16.8 per thousand in 1931 and 13.4 per thousand in 1940", in other words, a normal growth of 2,675,000 persons in 1931 and 2,569,000 in 1940, which shows the gaps caused by the calamities suffered between 1913 and 1940.

5. Between 1941-45, the war brought the population even greater ordeals. Dr. Biraben estimates that during this period there were in Russia 20.25 million births as against 40.55 million deaths (of which 14.7 million were due directly to the war) and 2 million emigrants.¹³ These figures on the whole confirm official Soviet data: these in fact estimate the population at 200.2 million in April, 1956,¹⁴ whereas Dr. Biraben arrives at the figure of 199.26 million on 1st January, 1956.¹⁵ According to the latter, the population fell from 195 million on 1st January, 1941, to 173 million on 1st January, 1946.¹⁶

The sharp drop in births during these five years is confirmed by the reduction in the number of school children. During 1940-41, there

10. *Population, ibid.*, page 38.

11. *Ibid.*, page 40.

12. *GSE*, Vol. 50, page 105.

13. *Population, ibid.*, page 48.

14. Digest, *The National Economy of the U.S.S.R.*, Moscow, 1956, page 18.

15. *Population, ibid.*, page 49.

16. *Ibid.*, page 48.

were 34,783,777 pupils in primary, secondary and seven-year schools, whereas during the school year 1956-57, there were only 28,185,457,¹⁷ a reduction, namely, of 6,598,420. The school population increased slightly in 1957-58, reaching 28,694,195. *The Great Soviet Encyclopædia* itself notes "that the reduction in the number of school children . . . as compared with the year 1940-41, is due to the fact that as from the school year 1949-50, it is the children born during the war who started their schooling".

*

*

*

To all these causes of rural depopulation must be added the disturbing increase of abortions. The social causes which force the female peasant or factory worker to have recourse to abortion are too numerous to go into here. Abortion, prohibited in Tsarist Russia, but which wreaked such havoc during the troubled years of the revolution, was legalised by Government decree of 18th November, 1920. At this time the Government had more important things to do than to worry about the falling birthrate. It was concerned primarily to safeguard the health of women, whose labour-power was vital during the absence of the men who were fighting. In 1936, however, both the Party and the Government recognised the urgent menace of the falling birthrate: on the 27th June, 1936, abortion was once more forbidden, except in cases where pregnancy represented a serious danger to the mother, or in cases of serious hereditary diseases. Abortions could be performed thereafter only in hospitals or maternity clinics. Upon conviction for clandestine abortion, women were to be sentenced to a "public rebuke", with a maximum fine of 300 roubles for a subsequent offence. But the social causes of abortion have not been eliminated, despite all the measures taken for the protection of mother and child, in particular the decree of the Supreme Soviet of 8th July, 1944, increasing State aid for pregnant women, mothers of large families and unmarried mothers, and creating the honorific title of "Heroine Mother", the decoration "Glory of Motherhood", and the "Mother's Medal".

Despite this attempt, the prohibition of abortion has proved to be a remedy worse than the disease. Performed by ignorant and unskilled women, abortions increased, killing or maiming a great number of women. Instead of contributing to the growth of population and manpower, this prohibition made matters even more difficult.

It was because of this that abortions were again made legal in November, 1955, and that the Ministry of Public Health recognised the need to disseminate knowledge of contraception.

*

*

*

Several other factors, although of lesser importance, contributed to the falling birthrate, factors such as internment in camps for

17. GSE, 1958 Year Book, page 81.

"rehabilitation through labour" and the mass transfers of population after the war, as of the Crimean Tatars and the Caucasian Tchetchen-Ingoush.

Thus the population which is to carry out the seven-year plan contains a number of shrunken age-groups. Assuming that the actual working life begins at the age of 18, we find that the years in which these various age-groups enter the cycle of production are as shown in the following table:

<i>Year of Birth</i>	<i>Entry into Production</i>
1916 to 1917	1932 to 1935
1918 to 1922	1936 to 1940
1931 to 1936	1949 to 1954
1939 to 1946	1957 to 1964

In addition, the age-groups which began work in 1932-1940 were especially decimated by the famine of 1932-34 and by the war of 1941-45. The period of reconstruction which followed the war, and that from 1949 to 1954, were therefore the most adversely affected by the lack of new manpower. After the improvements of 1955-56, a new period of shrunken age-groups manifests itself as from 1957.

But quite apart from these handicaps which affect the population as a whole, the rural areas suffered in addition from the drift to the towns brought on by heavy industrialisation.

From 1926 to 1939, 18.5 million people left the country for the town. In addition, villages which were transformed into towns had a population of 5.8 million. The natural growth of the rural population rose during this period to 18.2 million. Nevertheless, as 5.8 million peasants became citizens of the villages become towns, the actual rural population fell by 6.1 million during that period.¹⁸

The percentage of rural to total population continues to decline: ¹⁹

Census of 17th December, 1926	82.1 per cent.
Census of 17th January, 1939	67.1 per cent.
1940 (estimated)	68.4 per cent.
April, 1956 (estimated)	56.6 per cent.

Official Soviet sources and newspapers customarily pass over in silence, or misrepresent, all data indicating that rural manpower is certainly not adequate to reach the objectives laid down in five- or seven-year plans.²⁰ Yet it is only when one takes this shortage into

18. *GSE*, 1st edition, Vol. "U.S.S.R.", col. 63.

19. *GSE*, 1957 Year Book, page 5.

20. In the "Shorthand Report" of the Plenum of December, 1958, the 540 pages of which are crammed with all sorts of figures illustrating the failures of agriculture in 1946-53, and its brilliant successes in 1954-58, one finds only one single admission by Goriatchev, Secretary of the Regional Committee of the Party (Kalinin Region): "On the kolkhozes of this region there were before the war 529,000 able-bodied members; now there are only 270,000". (Page 170.)

account that numbers of things in the measures taken by the Party and Government, and in plans set afoot, become readily explainable.

* * *

The lamentable state of agriculture and stock-breeding since the war, and especially in 1949-53, fully set forth during the 1958 Plenum and attributed by Khrushchev and his subordinates to the maladministration of Malenkov and the Anti-Party Group, is, at least in great part, in reality to be attributed to the lack of new manpower during 1949-54.

Since the Plenum of September, 1953, that is, since the dominance of Khrushchev in the "collective leadership", a number of new concessions have been granted to rural workers: reduction in taxes and increase in their allowances, the latter with the object of diminishing the exodus to the cities and improving conditions of work. But if these measures induced the members of the kolkhoze to stay in the villages, they nonetheless in no way solved the problem of new manpower. In 1955, therefore, 640,000 soldiers were demobilised and sent home. A further demobilisation of 1,200,000 men was ordered in 1956.²¹ These measures, presented by pro-Soviet and Soviet propaganda as proof of the peaceful intentions of Moscow, were in reality imposed by the threat of a new series of shrunken age-groups as from 1957. A very large proportion of these 1,840,000 men went into agriculture. In addition, the Party and the Young Communists (Komsomol) assigned a part of their membership to work in the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Administrative reorganisation enabled the Government to free a number of officials for agricultural work. Moreover, a proportion of those finishing secondary education also swelled the ranks of agricultural workers. Let us note finally that the reorganisation of primary and secondary education, "polytechnicalisation", according to Soviet terminology, envisages a combination of education with productive work.

From some of the speeches made in the course of the Plenum of December, 1958, we learn of the position of the kolkhozes before the Plenum of September, 1953, and of the effects of the measures taken since then:

In Moldavia, the number of kolkhoze-members able to work and taking an active part in production increased by 100,000 during these five years. . . . The abolition of 20 administrative districts made it possible to assign to best cadres to agriculture. . . . The number of specialists in the kolkhozes trebled in five years; each of the 752 kolkhozes now has an average of five specialists with school certificates or diplomas of higher education.²²

In Lithuania, the increase of allowances has arrested the exodus of able-bodied kolkhoze-members which was so frequent before. It has also made possible the entry of new members into the kolkhozes: during these last three years, 44,000 persons have joined, many of whom came from the cities.²³

21. GSE, Vol. 50, page 241.

22. Short. Rep., pages 126-127.

23. *Ibid.*, page 153.

In Georgia, many kolkhozes found themselves almost ruined before 1953, members leaving them and preferring to look elsewhere for a job. Of 2,400 kolkhozes, 600 only allowed their members more than five roubles per work-shift (*trudodin*). Many paid only one rouble; a quarter of the members received nothing from the kolkhozes and were leaving them. At present, the situation has distinctly improved.²⁴

In the region of Smolensk, before the Plenum of September, 1953, agriculture was in complete decay. It is difficult to imagine how bad conditions were in the countryside. There existed whole districts where in the villages not only were no new houses being built, but where even the roofs of old houses had not been restored.²⁵ This is absolutely true, comrades. In almost every village, one could see several houses with doors and windows boarded up. In villages of 20, 30 or 40 houses, there sometimes lived only a few kolkhoze-members. Within three years, the élite had left our region. . . . In carrying out the decision of the September Plenum, the Regional Committee of the Party has directed 300 of its best workers to the task of leadership in the districts. The District Party Committees, in their turn, directed 825 of their most experienced workers to the kolkhozes, especially in the capacity of chairmen.²⁶

In Kazakhstan, owing to the insufficient density of the population, and to the suddenly increased volume of agricultural production, the republic lacks manpower in general and skilled staffs in particular. For the 1958 harvest we were short of 277,000 workers, of whom 220,000 in the sovkhoses.²⁷

Hundreds of thousands of young men and girls with secondary school diplomas will every year begin work in the kolkhozes. Already today we have remarkable examples of the combination of school work with work on the land. One can cite in particular, as models, the school brigades in the counties of Stavropol and Krasnodar, in the Rostov region, in that of Riazan, etc.²⁸

Khrushchev certainly had in mind the district of the *stanitsa* Kanievskaya in the county of Krasnodar, where "schools have helped appreciably in the breeding of ducks. School children there have bred 183,000 ducks in 1957 and 360,000 in 1958".²⁹

During 1954-57, approximately 500,000 boys and girls with secondary school diplomas came to work on the kolkhozes. . . . During the last five years, more than 950,000 young people have been sent to stock-farms by the Komsomol and by youth organisations. 1,300,000 young people are actually working in stock-breeding, that is, more than three times the number in 1953. About 40,000 kolkhoze farms are staffed entirely by young people.³⁰

To alleviate somewhat the shortage of manpower in agriculture, the temporary mobilisation of townspeople for the harvest had been a very common practice in 1954-58. Khrushchev tells us that "more than 3,000,000 students, young workers and white-collar workers have taken part in bringing in the harvest in the virgin lands during these

24. Short. Rep., page 269.

25. In this region, the roofs of peasant houses are made of thatch which should, in principle, be renewed every autumn. To allow the thatch to rot because of an inability to renew it, is, in the case of a Russian peasant, proof of extreme poverty.

26. Short. Rep., pages 393-394.

27. *Ibid.*, page 104.

28. *Ibid.*, page 70.

29. *Ibid.*, page 144.

30. *Ibid.*, page 325.

last three years".³¹ But the help of the improvised workers did not prove very profitable:

In the county of Altai, young people helped every year with bringing in the harvest. An appeal was even made to military units during the first years the virgin lands came into production. In 1957, 50,000 students came from other regions of the U.S.S.R. . . . The students and other categories of workers made themselves useful only on the threshing floor, limiting themselves to cleaning the grain and to assuring its loading and unloading. Which is why, since 1958, it has been decided to do without their help.³²

In Kazakhstan, it has been necessary to mobilise temporary labour composed mainly of students and pupils from the technical colleges. 118,000 students worked in the fields of Kazakhstan in 1956, 125,000 in 1957 and 160,000 in 1958. . . . It is not at all desirable that young people should be sent so far, especially in the middle of their studies. In four years the State spent 500 million roubles on their transport alone. . . . From 1959 onwards, it is imperative that we give up sending the student youth to Kazakhstan to help bring in the harvest.³³

All these measures, taken in 1954-58 to increase manpower, have certainly contributed greatly to the progress in agriculture and to the betterment of the lot of the peasants.

However, as from 1957, a new series of shrunken age-groups entered into the labour or production. The gaps due to the war years were made even larger by the fall in births resulting from the fact that the already reduced age-groups born in 1918-22 reached marriageable age between 1939-46. The effect of these gaps will be felt until at least 1964. Because of this the Soviet seven-year plan for agriculture will come up against problems of manpower almost identical with those of 1949-54.

These facts explain why Khrushchev, the Plenum of December, 1958, and the XXIst Congress of the Communist Party emphasised the absolute necessity of increasing *per capita* productivity and intensifying labour for the benefit of collective cultivation, the which will lead to the disappearance of privately owned cattle and of private cultivation of individual allotments.³⁴

Mechanisation as a Remedy

It is the increase of mechanisation in agriculture and stock-breeding that can make up for the deficiency in manpower and raise productivity.

Even though already widespread in the U.S.S.R., such mechanisation, to be effective, requires, in addition to a sufficient number of machines appropriate to each production process, substantial staffs with experience of ever more varied and complicated machines. These staffs of specialist mechanics are, however, still in short supply.

A considerable effort is being made to bring the numbers up to scratch: 328,000 young skilled workers from agricultural engineering

31. Short. Rep., page 15.

32. *Ibid.*, page 319.

33. *Ibid.*, page 104.

34. See my article in the periodical *East and West*, No. 217.

colleges were sent in 1957 to the kolkhozes and sovkhoses.³⁵ But even these large numbers hardly suffice to meet the urgent needs of agriculture for specialist mechanics, who are everywhere in great demand, more especially where virgin lands have been put under cultivation.

In the county of Altai, the kolkhozes and sovkhoses require trained manpower, workers to drive the tractors, combine-harvesters, motor lorries, mowing machines, etc. To get agricultural work going in 1959 we need at least 100,000 specialist mechanics, so that every tractor and every machine can be worked by two teams. We must, therefore, during the winter, train 40,000 specialist mechanics in large numbers of skills. . . . Their training has already begun at a number of different courses, schools and clubs. Workers in district administration, accountants and clerks, are already studying at these, as are able-bodied and literate kolkhoze and sovkhose workers. In many districts, this instruction is organised so as to put everyone in charge of a machine at the "crack of a pistol".³⁶

Given the rigour of the winter in the Altai and the difficulty of using tractors and other agricultural machinery at that time of year, one may well wonder whether a hurried instruction will be enough to enable these specialist mechanics properly to handle and especially to keep in running order machines which in some cases have very delicate parts.

As to the professional specialist mechanics, it is not enough to allocate them to the kolkhozes and sovkhoses; one also must be able to keep them there. This, in the present state of Russian villages and sovkhoses, is a problem not so easily solved. Thus in the region of Orenburg:

The principal weakness in the running of the sovkhoses is the lack of permanent staffs of specialist mechanics. As a rule it is the young men, fresh from agricultural engineering colleges, who are sent to the sovkhoses. For some seven months of the year, they must live on the land, in camps or caravans, most of which lack every amenity. This is why so many specialist mechanics leave the sovkhoses in the autumn and go back home.³⁷

In Kazakhstan, fluctuations in the labour force are still very great. 163,000 workers left sovkhoses in this republic during the past four years. This is quite abnormal. What is the reason for these defections? First, the lack of housing. . . . The building of premises for the public services provided for for the period of organisation of the sovkhoses is also behind schedule. This position does not contribute to the stabilisation of labour conditions and the establishment of a permanent staff of specialist mechanics.³⁸

On the other hand, the salaries of trained personnel are not high enough in the sovkhoses. In one of the virgin land sovkhoses, created in 1954 in the region of Koktchetav, in Kazakhstan, "the head of a tractor team draws only 510 roubles per month, plus the standard-yield bonus. However, this bonus is payable only for the time spent working in the fields, that is, for two to three weeks in the spring, and eight to ten weeks at the end of the summer and the beginning of the

35. *GSE*, 1958 Year Book, page 56.

36. *Short. Rep.*, pages 319-320.

37. *Ibid.*, page 187.

38. *Ibid.*, page 103.

autumn. Thus, for nine months, the head of the tractor team has to be satisfied with 510 roubles. But a team in one of the virgin land sovkhoses is expected to cultivate from 4,000 to 6,000 hectares³⁹

Faced with these facts, Khrushchev, at the 1958 Plenum, himself admitted that the rate of pay would have to be revised.

Yet another disadvantage attends the use of specialist mechanics assigned to work on leaving college: soon after their arrival at the sovkhose, they have to do their military service and are not seen again after they have finished it.

Disagreeable as it is, it is necessary to ask the Presidium of the Central Committee to study the possibility of granting specialist mechanics of the virgin land sovkhoses their deferment. They will then perhaps have time to marry in the sovkhoses and build a house there, which may induce them to return once they have completed their military service.⁴⁰

The defection of the specialist mechanics from the virgin land sovkhoses must indeed be a burning problem, for a matter of such delicacy to be raised at the Plenum of the Central Committee.

However, the hope that marriage will cause them to settle in the sovkhoses appears to be somewhat premature:

For some years now, the possibility of sending girls to the sovkhoses of the virgin lands has been studied. . . . There are many candidates; but the question is still not settled. We are asking the Councils of Ministers of the Republics of Kazakhstan and of the U.S.S.R. to work out as quickly as possible the means for carrying this into effect, so that the girls may, as from now, prepare themselves actually to set out in the coming spring.⁴¹

The Lack of Equipment

The difficulties attending the mechanisation of Soviet agriculture are not limited to the problems of manpower and staff. Agricultural machinery, too, is not all it should be. On this subject Khrushchev remarked:

We must make a determined effort to increase the production of spares for tractors and agricultural machinery, so that these may be marketed in unlimited quantities as from 1959. . . . The development of new types of machines is not keeping pace with present needs. Our designers have not yet succeeded in evolving a good machine for the harvesting of sugar beet, indispensable in the kolkhozes and sovkhoses. The mechanisation of the production, and especially of the harvesting of cotton, lags even further behind needs. . . . We are not yet provided with an efficient potato-lifting machine. . . .

In stock-breeding, manual work still predominates. At the present time the provision of water in stock farms is only 27 per cent mechanised, and the milking of cows only 3.6 per cent. . . .

Up to now our industry has made every effort to deliver to the agricultural sector the greatest possible number of tractors and combine-harvesters. . . . The essential need at present is to organise production in sufficient quantity of other farm machinery absolutely indispensable to agriculture: in the first instance, machines which will release from

39. Short. Rep., pages 251-252.

40. *Ibid.*, page 188.

41. *Ibid.*, pages 251-252.

heavy labour the greatest number of people and lead to increased production at less cost.⁴²

The speech of N. F. Manukowsky, specialist mechanic at the Kirov kolkhoze, in the region of Voronezh, gives some details about these machines:

The new tractors are of sound workmanship and function without breakdowns. As to other new agricultural machines, the workmanship is in the majority of cases crude: welding is badly done, certain mechanisms and parts in time reveal major defects. . . . The sowing machine "SKGK-6", as well as the slightly different model "SKGK-6B", manufactured by the *Krasnaya Zvezda* works at Kirovgrad . . . breaks up the seed . . . the sowing is irregular. There are great defects in the cultivators "KPN-4.2". . . . The combine-harvester "SK-2.6", used to collect green fodder for silage, is not a bad machine, but it, too, has its defects.⁴³

In Byelorussia, where peat, used as manure, plays an important rôle, the kolkhoze peasants in 1958 had to dig up with spades approximately 9,000,000 tons, namely, half the total tonnage produced in the Republic, suitable machines being produced in only very limited quantities. . . . The liming of the ground, essential in Byelorussia, suffers from the lack of machinery, particularly machinery which will mechanically crumble limestone. In 1958, only 125,000 hectares were limed, of the 2½ to 3,000,000 hectares which required this treatment.⁴⁴

Repair of agricultural machinery is very badly catered for: "105 sovkhoses in the region of Koustanai have no repair workshops. The machinery has to be mended in the open, in very difficult conditions".⁴⁵

One could quote complaints of this kind *ad infinitum*; they prove that the level of mechanisation of Soviet agriculture is far from keeping pace with the demands of the seven-year plan.

In addition, transport difficulties are numerous, especially in the virgin land sovkhoses:

The volume of transport in the Altai is very great. At harvest time, 13 to 14 million tons have to be transported in two or two-and-a-half months. For this purpose the Government sends us every year 12,000 to 15,000 motor lorries collected from the most diverse regions.

We consider that in future the transfer of these lorries over such considerable distances will have to stop. The railways are burdened with them to no purpose. These lorries for the most part reach us in no condition to withstand the pressure of work required of them during harvesting. Furthermore, they are diverted from work, itself also important, in the factories of Moscow, the Urals or other industrial centres. We propose that these motor lorries be replaced by a large number of trailers, which will form trailer-trains drawn by our own lorries and wheeled tractors.⁴⁶

Only an incorrigible optimist could expect good results from the transfer of these lorries. In fact, factory managers from Moscow or elsewhere unquestionably choose the worst junk in their car parks for dispatch to the Altai.

From the speeches made at the Plenum of December, 1958, we also learn much about the many difficulties Soviet agriculture and

42. Short. Rep., pages 57-59.

43. *Ibid.*, pages 297-298.

44. *Ibid.*, pages 165-166.

45. *Ibid.*, page 327.

46. *Ibid.*, page 320.

stock-breeding experience concerning manure, fodder, storage and the transport of various products. Their disclosures go beyond the framework of this article, but, by way of example, the fate of part of the 1958 wheat harvest from the virgin lands may be mentioned:

The Central Committee of the Komsomol and the paper *Komsomolskaya Pravda* have during the last few days received information about the carelessness with which the wheat harvested from the virgin lands has been stored. The manager of the wheat collection depot in Uralsk, the secretary of the Party Office and a group of workers, inform us by telegram received two days ago (16th December) that 25,000 tons of wheat are lying in the open at the depot, from which they cannot be dispatched. Instead of the expected 5,100 trucks, the railways have supplied only 2,350 in five months. Similar information has reached us from the regions of Kokchetav, Karaganda and from others.⁴⁷

After having lain in the open for five months and having been subjected to inclement autumn weather, the wheat was presumably useless, except as organic manure, so dear to Lysenko.* Nevertheless, it undoubtedly was included in the figure for the harvest announced by Khrushchev.

* * *

All these difficulties make the success of the seven-year plan highly problematical, and the target amounts will no doubt once more be postponed to a later date.

But the major difficulty, the lack of manpower, certainly goes beyond the framework of mere economics. It seems to be at the root of Khrushchev's doctrine of "peaceful co-existence" and of his repeated insistence on calling together a "summit conference".

Despite, or possibly thanks to, all his usual bluster designed to impress and unnerve the West, Khrushchev perhaps quite simply counts on such a conference to obtain enough concessions in exchange for a few spectacular ones of his own (such as, for example, the evacuation of the satellite countries, which would be of more use to him than of profit to the West). He could then demobilise some further hundreds of thousands, or grant deferments to a big enough number of age-groups to allow him more or less to fill the gaps in the ranks of those on whom falls the task of achieving the 1959-65 Plan.

The essential for the U.S.S.R. is to come through the difficult period of 1957-64, at whatever the cost. After this, and with a more flourishing population, the U.S.S.R. may attain to a much more real power than it has at present.**

47. Short. Rep., page 329.

* The last thing one could reproach Lysenko with is being in favour of organic manure.—Ed.

** A "much more real power" is in no way in the interest of the Russian people, for whom the end of power politics (the actual politics of Russia) represents much rather the prerequisite for the overcoming of their miserable conditions of existence. But the present rulers cling to power politics, being in this supported by their alleged enemies. The Western Governments are, of course, well aware of the weakness and backwardness of Russia; but make use of Khrushchev's "usual bluster" to mislead their own peoples, to the profit and advantage of the business partnership they have with the Kremlin. (For further light on the "business partnership", see Ernst Zander's "War as a Way Out?", *Contemporary Issues*, Vol. 2, No. 7.)—Ed.

Andrew Maxwell

FUTHER LIGHT ON THE STATE OF RUSSIAN AGRICULTURE

Reports in *The Times* of the recent meetings of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Moscow underline the correctness of M. Delimars' conjectures about the fate of the seven-year agricultural plan, even though no mention is made in them (other than incidentally) of the crucial question of shortage of manpower. There is no need to dwell here upon the fact that these "revelations" were made in the manner of true Stalinist "self-criticism", with Khrushchev in the role of the omniscient bear-baiter harrying the victims. It should, nonetheless, be noted as symptomatic of the fact that, genuine improvements notwithstanding, nothing has changed fundamentally since the days of Stalin: the anarchy of profit-production prevails and requires such ostentatiously staged *mea culpas* and the sacking of a number of officials (as scapegoats as much as for incompetence), whenever the contradiction between boastfully mendacious propaganda claims and chaotic reality becomes too pronounced.

The following extracts speak for themselves:

The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee declared today . . . that Russia's level and rate of growth of agricultural production "are insufficient". This was especially true of the output of animal products. . . . The Report said the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers had been instructed to draft and endorse a concrete programme to increase the output of agricultural products "with a view to making up for the lost time and achieving incomparably higher rates of growth of agricultural products". (20th January, 1961.)

For a couple of years the previous Ministry [of Agriculture] . . . has been continually criticized for failing to ensure that the necessary machines, men and parts are on the spot. . . . It has been admitted that the harvest last year was only a little better than in 1959, which was a bad year. With the population rising by over three million annually, this points to a serious position in agriculture. . . . Peasants have been given an assurance that their collective farms will not in the foreseeable future be turned into state farms where workers are paid as in a factory. This should encourage them to plan ahead. (16th January, 1961.)

"This is speculation—not even speculation, but a major crime," Mr. Khrushchev said, interrupting the report of the Prime Minister of the Ukraine which told of falsification of achievements and juggling with production figures. The Soviet leader cited officials who bought butter from shops so as to deliver it to the state as part of their own production quota. It was reported . . . that collective farms had indulged in such practices as buying cattle at high market prices and selling to the state at lower ones and sending prize bulls and milk cows to the slaughterhouse—all in the name of fulfilling the plan.

The sad facts of the disappointing harvest which has stricken the Soviet Union for the second successive year were faced squarely by the speakers. In the Ukraine an average of 15.7 cwt. of cereals were produced per hectare (2.5 acres) as against the planned 18. In Kazakhstan 3m. hectares (about 7,500,000 acres) were planted late and the average yield per hectare was 8.4 in place of the expected 10.5 cwt. Of the 923 state and collective farms in the new Virgin soils region, only 336 fulfilled their plan. This shortage of grain, particularly corn suitable for pig raising, has resulted in excessive slaughter of horned cattle. (19th January, 1961.)

By contrast with industry, agriculture did very moderately [in 1960]. . . . Although grain production is said to have increased slightly, it remained well below the record levels of 1958 (when the harvest was claimed to be 141m. tons). Production of meat and milk fell, and there were serious difficulties with fodder supplies. . . . The figures . . . underline the impossibility of achieving the very ambitious goals set for agriculture in the seven-year plan. It is significant that the ownership of private livestock, and the output of meat and milk in private holdings, are well down, and part of the difficulty may be arising from resentment at the pressure put on them to restrict their "private enterprise" and work harder for the collective farms. . . .

The numbers of "workers and employees" shows a record jump, of 9,500,000 persons in one year. This category excludes collective-farm peasants and co-operative artisans, and the large increase is due to the conversion of many collective farms into state farms (which converts the peasants into state "workers"), and of most producers' co-operatives into state-owned industrial workshops. (10th February, 1961.)

At the January, 1961, meeting of the Central Committee of the Party, the emphasis was transferred from industry to the flagging agricultural sector and it was decided that every effort should be made to tighten agricultural management and create incentives for greater agricultural production. . . . What was significant was the stress placed on the need to improve living conditions in agriculture. It was decided that a complete revision of the wage and norm fixing system for state farms should be carried out before the end of 1961 and payment should be made dependent on the amount and quality of production.

As in industry, premiums should be established for the fulfilment of agricultural targets and also for doing this more cheaply than planned. Particular stress was laid on housing and welfare. It was declared that in 1961 a nation-wide review of welfare facilities should be carried out and urban trade unions would be encouraged to "adopt" rural areas and give them cultural and material help.

This preoccupation with welfare in the state farms—which also emerged repeatedly in Mr. Khrushchev's speeches during the past fortnight—is to a large extent a response to an old problem in Soviet society of workers shifting restlessly from job to job in search of better living conditions.

Mr. Grishin [chairman of the All Union Central Council of Trade Unions] admitted that in 1960 several thousand workers had left state farms in the Russian Republic because of inadequate living conditions. . . . (14th February, 1961.)

Deus Ex Machina!

Harvard University has taught a course in human relations by machine. (*The Times*, 8th February, 1961.)

Paul Ecker

SANE: PORTRAIT OF AUTOCRACY IN ACTION

For two years the growing sentiment in the United States against continued nuclear testing has been gathered, for the most part, behind the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, launched in the summer of 1957 with full-page newspaper ads across the nation proclaiming the urgency of organizing against nuclear madness. With a nucleus of Quakers, other pacifists, World Federalists and prominent personages of adjacent shades of opinion, the committee called for response from those desirous of campaigning for an end to nuclear weapons tests, banning of atomic weapons and efforts in general to bring about "world peace".

The response exceeded the organizers' fondest expectations. Filled-out coupons poured in to the committee, and within a few months branches were organized in cities throughout the country. The committee invited those of diverse opinions who agreed with its general aims to join its ranks, and thousands responded. But a rude shock awaited many of them, who soon found that diverse views were welcome only so long as they were not expressed. For those entering Sane (as it has become popularly known) with the idea that they might alter, strengthen, or otherwise affect any of its planks through democratic discussion and decision quickly were disabused of that idea. They found that they were members of an organization which functioned exclusively from the top down, in which they not only were powerless to alter the leadership or policy of the national organization, but could not even decide the leadership and orientation of their local groups, whose officers and statements were determined by ukase from the national committee. What this meant in content will be examined later; for the time being, we restrict the discussion to its operation in form.

Members of Sane's New York City committee were among the first to learn in what type of organization they were functioning. Partly an *ad hoc* body selected by the national leadership, partly representative of Sane's evolving New York area groups, its members soon were informed which of the two fiddlers was calling the tune. Delegates who sought to have the committee adopt a statement different from and stronger than the national committee's (although not conflicting with it) were told that any such adoption would bring instant disaffiliation from the national organization, which insisted that the New York committee issue no statement that did not virtually duplicate the national committee's policy declaration. It

also became apparent that there was no machinery available for changing the national committee's policy from within, since this committee was self-constituted and not subject to replacement by a majority of the membership. It became manifest, in other words, that Sane members were to have the same freedom as members of the Catholic Church—to join, to repeat doctrine and to proselytize.

Lest any of the foregoing appear to be calumny, we introduce into evidence excerpts from a rather remarkable letter sent to all Sane groups in May, 1960, over the signature of Donald Keys, Sane's executive director. This letter, precipitated by journalistic and legislative attacks on Sane as an allegedly Communist-infiltrated organization, states Sane's dictatorial organizational philosophy with gratifying frankness. The relevant section is as follows (emphasis ours):

It should be noted that the National Committee began knowing full well that it risked the co-operation of unwanted people on the one hand and attack from those who basically disagreed with its policy, on the other. The National Committee was fully aware that it was proceeding to work in an exposed salient, and incidentally a salient which at that time meant complete opposition to the prevailing United States policy on testing.

In order to provide as much as possible against those eventualities, the National Committee created *a deliberately autocratic organization in which the ultimate power of decision and policy making resides in the members of the corporation, a small number of the national leadership.* At the same time, the National Committee began a process of chartering its local groups. *If a local group deviates from the declared policy of the organization, it is subject to disaffiliation and deprivation of the use of the name.* Co-operative action between the local units and the national organization has been provided for by electing *a minority of the National Board members from the local committees.*

There is no possible way in which the organization can be turned aside from its purpose or its goals or its methods of action.

In co-operating with the local committees, the national office has not established a screening process based upon innuendoes or questions regarding previous affiliations. Co-operation has been put on a "performance basis". If the performance of a group or the responsible persons in it varies from the duly established policies, a warning is first given and if not corrected, disaffiliation can be voted by the National Board after due and careful consideration.

Thus the case for "autocracy" in an organization which presumes to represent the interests of the American population in striving for an end to nuclear testing and atomic stockpiling. The organizers of Sane have found, like other good autocrats of modern times, that democracy is all very well as an ikon to be polished up for ceremonial occasions but that as a practical matter it is a luxury to be dispensed with. Indeed Sane, which is so anxious to clear its skirts of the Communist taint, has taken its organizational principles straight from the school of Stalinist party dictatorship, which, like Sane, has created "a deliberately autocratic organization in which the ultimate power of decision and policy making resides in the members of the corporation, a small number of the national leadership", but which, unlike Sane, thought it was something that should be pushed under the carpet rather than proudly flaunted. In the Communist Party, too, "there is no possible way in which the

organization can be turned aside from its purpose or its goals or its methods of action" because, as in Sane, "if a local group deviates from the declared policy of the organization, it is subject to disaffiliation". Sane, like many before it, has apparently decided that it is possible to fight the Communists only with their own weapons—the effectiveness of which in achieving Sane's avowed aim we shall have an opportunity to examine later on. Were these "deliberately autocratic" principles to be adopted by the government or a trade union, the liberals who constitute the "members of the corporation" would be the first to protest. But in an organization which invites the American people to follow it in a campaign against nuclear suicide, it is presumably unobjectionable, nay praiseworthy, nay indispensable. The organizers of Sane clearly hold that democracy is a sweetmeat to be enjoyed if the circumstances permit, not an indispensable nutrient for a truly popular movement. Perhaps a brief exploration of the function of democracy is in order.

Democracy is not merely a "preferable" form of organization that gives everybody his say and the majority its wish, a benevolent concept which indulges the popular will. It is the indispensable corrective for error and misdirection by the leadership, the only protection against violation of the majority will *and interest*, the only guarantee against perversion of the organization's aims and principles by a leadership responsible only to itself. Its presence distinguishes the organization which is able to become a tool of the popular will from that which seeks to use the popular will as a tool. It can be discarded, as in the case of Sane, only on the outright autocratic principle that the leaders are infallible, that they alone know what is best, that it is the privilege of the members only to follow. History has well demonstrated, however, that the leaders of this type of organization will violate even their own principles when the occasion—their own interests—demands. Whether Sane has proved the exception we shall have a chance to see.

Let us examine the Keys declaration more closely. It is to be noted that the National Committee said nothing in its original call about "a deliberately autocratic organization". By what politico-moral right, then, did it summon all those opposed to nuclear testing and stockpiling to join a movement in which only "a small number" of the sponsors, the unidentified "members of the corporation", had "the ultimate power of decision and policy making"? This minority rule was not qualified but only camouflaged, Keys' letter makes it clear, by the election of "a minority of the National Board members from the local committees", a step admittedly designed to provide a transmission belt from the leaders to the members rather than one from the members to the leaders. All of this is avowedly justified in order that there shall be "no possible way in which the organization can be turned aside from its purpose or its goals or its methods of action"—an interesting statement which it will be rewarding to scrutinize more closely.

In the first place, it is untrue. The organization can be turned aside from any one of the three by the simple expedient of persuading,

intimidating, bribing, or otherwise inducing a majority of "the members of the corporation" (how many, it would be intriguing to know) to so turn the organization aside. Neither the membership nor, for that matter, the majority of the national committee, no matter how overwhelmingly predominant, would have any recourse against such a change, no matter how much time, effort and money they may have put into the organization's activity. The point is not, of course, that the corporation members are likely to perform a complete about-face, but that they, and they alone, can determine what tangent, what new direction, the committee is to follow at any given stage. Their decisions are subject to no check, no review from the standpoint of their compatibility with Sane's avowed aims. The organization's members have, like—let us face it—those of the Communist Party, only two choices: To accept these decisions or get out. If they attempt to do otherwise, the reward awaiting them for victory is . . . "disaffiliation and deprival of the use of the name".

But even if we accept the declaration of immutability at its face value, what virtue is there to the existence of "no possible way in which the organization can be turned aside from its purpose or its goals or its methods [!] of action"? Immediate goals are subject to constant review from the aspect of their appropriateness to the ultimate purpose; yesterday's goal may be entirely inappropriate, nay, self-defeating, in the light of today's circumstances. And to invest "methods of action" with unalterability regardless of their success is to invest social-political tactics with the sanctity normally reserved for the Ten Commandments. New problems, new situations, call for new goals and methods; under Sane's hierarchical structure each decision on these is encrusted with infallibility and is binding upon the membership. If these decisions should be wrong, there is no machinery for their correction, no arena for discussion, no room for opposition. The organization, its members, its apparatus, its funds, are but a gigantic plaything for the corporation members, who are free to deal with it with no more responsibility, no more restraint, than a child disposing of its doll.

The foregoing is all in the realm of theory. How have matters worked out in practice? How have those policies formulated by the infallible corporation members stacked up against events? How successful have been these "goals and methods" which are immune from critical evaluation and change? Let us see.

At its very inception, Sane was beset by a schism between those who proposed immediate unilateral cessation of atomic tests and those who sought to tie the committee's chariot to those four-power disarmament negotiations which were already approaching senility. It was not a deep schism, to be sure, because the issue already had been decided in favor of the latter course by the corporation members, and the Quakers and most of the other minority stockholders who favored a unilateral end to testing accepted this decision without a whimper. The handful who objected were told—in some cases by the Quakers themselves—that their viewpoint had little future in Sane. Any local chapter that attempted to propagate unilateral cessation,

they were informed, would quickly find itself outside the corporation, while the machinery for altering the committee's policy on a national scale was conspicuous by its non-existence.

With the opposition thus silenced, Sane drove ahead on its chosen path as cheerleader for the negotiators at Geneva. Instead of seeking to place responsibility equally on the United States and Russia for continuing tests in the face of their demonstrated harmfulness, it placed responsibility on no one, offering instead its compliments to those who were polluting the atmosphere for condescending to continue their negotiating marathon. This tack, ironically, attracted into Sane not only the apologists for United States policy but also those whom the Sane leadership was supposedly so concerned about excluding—the apologists for Russia. Finding a congenial atmosphere in an organization which, if it did not excoriate Washington, did not attack Moscow either, the Communists flocked into many of Sane's local chapters and were not "disaffiliated" for the simple reason that Sane policy—negotiated disarmament—was their policy, too. The only successful method by which Sane leaders could have averted this invasion was, as put with clarity by A. J. Muste, by "defining their programs, pronouncements and activities so clearly as against testing or other nuclear war preparation by *any* nation that those who really cannot accept that stand find the organization unconvivial and not useful for their purposes". But, in fact, whether consciously or not, Sane leaders found the Communists useful for *their* purposes: Promoting reliance upon big-power negotiations and counterbalancing the unilateral cessationists in their own ranks.

A milestone in this path of tail-ending the big powers (Russia as well as the United States) came when Sane hailed Khrushchev's announced unilateral cessation of testing—a cessation Sane had not had the temerity to advocate—despite its blatant propagandistic timing immediately following the conclusion of Russian tests which produced massive radioactive pollution, and preceding a scheduled series of American tests. The fact that it was a *conditional* cessation, dependent for its continuation on similar action by the United States, called for severe criticism and public warnings. That this precarious cessation has continued the world has to thank only the fact that the United States has been unwilling to antagonize international opinion by being the first to resume, although it is studiously preparing the ground at present for such a resumption. But it is to be noted that this discontinuation of tests, as tenuous as it is, has come about precisely *unilaterally* and not through the interminable negotiations about which Sane waxes so enthusiastic. The only guarantee of its continuance is sustained international pressure which holds responsible whichever power first resumes nuclear testing. The protracted negotiations and their inevitable failure merely prepares the justification for the principals to resume their lethal game. Indeed, it is high time for the movement to go forward and insist upon an end to the production of nuclear bombs and the dismantling of the plants that produce them. To continue fighting the battle on already gained terrain is self-defeating.

This was not the viewpoint of the Sane national committee, however, and if it was held by any of the membership it had little future under Sane's "autocratic" structure, in which discussion of policy is useless because it is all decided at the summit. The Sane leadership looked exclusively to Geneva and big-power negotiations. When the long hoped for summit meeting finally was announced, Sane was enraptured. Its largest mass meeting in New York City's Madison Square Garden was timed for the week of the summit conference and billed under the theme, "Salute to the Summit". "Big" political figures, never very vocal about ending nuclear tests but fully prepared to expostulate on the glories of negotiations in Paris, were enlisted to speak. Messages of encouragement were addressed to the negotiators. All was prepared for Sane's greatest moment of public glory. It was hardly Sane's fault that it did not quite come off.

The dénouement need not be embellished. Three days before the rally, the Paris conference exploded into smithereens before it began. As 15,000 persons gathered under Sane's aegis to "salute the summit", those whom Sane had cheered so heartily on to that international peak were on their way home to turn down the thermostat in the cold war.

If the Sane leadership learned anything from this, it has not been apparent. The committee has continued its orientation toward big-power maneuvering; the only noticeable change has been a sudden sensitivity, under reactionary attack, to the presence of Communists in its ranks. Henry Abrans, who was in charge of promotion for the Madison Square Garden rally, was the first to be sacrificed on this altar in a manner, Sane's supposed "performance basis" notwithstanding, hardly superior to the *modus operandi* of the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee itself.

Panic ensued, when the Sub-committee subpoenaed a group of Sane members it accused of Communist leanings. The members were expelled for "lack of co-operation" with this inquisitory agency, and Sane abandoned its "performance basis" by adopting a clause excluding "Communists" from membership, thus opening itself to precisely that heresy hunt which Keys had stated it was so concerned to avoid. The charter of the New York City chapter was revoked when it protested this arbitrary procedure and a new New York executive committee organized, consisting of eight appointees of the national committee and six representatives of local groups. The "corporation", having fired its unruly "employees", returned to "business".

This, then, is the proud record of that leadership whose decisions cannot be gainsaid, whose policy is subject to no control, whose program cannot be debated. Unlike in democratic organizations, there is no machinery for correcting mistakes, no process by which a wrong leadership can be replaced or an inadequate policy changed. Sane's "corporation members" are responsible to no one; who within this proudly autocratic organization is to call them to task!

The moral should be self-evident. An organization appealing for the support of the American people should be democratically consti-

tuted, without a vested leadership, confident that it can prevent the "contamination" by alien elements by a policy that makes the political environment inhospitable to them.

If Sane wishes to merit the leadership of those who are concerned about the perils of nuclear testing and H-bomb production, let it transform itself into that type of organization. If it does not, its future is in the past.

October, 1960.

A WORLD PLAN FOR THE SOLUTION OF MODERN SOCIETY'S ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CRISIS

Introduction

In recent decades numerous "plans" have been advanced for the solution of modern society's general crisis: a sequence of Five Year Plans in Russia, "Plans" in all countries under Russian influence, Assistance Plans in America, Recovery Plans for Britain, the Schuman Plan for Germany, the Monnet Plan for France, Five Year Plans in India, Afghanistan, Egypt and Turkey, a Seven Year Plan in Iran, a Four Year Plan in Israel and similar contrivances for other parts of the world.

The objective result of all this "planning" has become quite evident—instead of "solving" any problem it has everywhere led either to an increase in the general economic anarchy, mass misery and starvation, or has at the very least acted as a brake and a distorting factor on the economic development. "Planning" today is simply synonymous with control of production and accommodation of industry, agriculture and technology to the given condition of competition with its striving for monopolistic domination.

But even this attempted stabilization is vitiated by the centralization inherent in the movement of capital which all "plans" presuppose. At a time when technology has reached the level of automatic production, of small self-operating units, superfluity in the material means of life and, above all, the possibility of a natural release of production which undercuts the need for centralised control, the entire social structure becomes choked with "personnel", bureaucrats,

supervisors, officials, inspectors and similar elements whose sole task is to "control" in every field. Accordingly, all "plans" so far submitted invest with the management of economic affairs those agencies and individuals who not only play no rôle in productive activities, but whose decisions are formulated apart from plants and farms and are in fact hostile to any "natural" development. The economy is *policed*, not planned, and, in the name of "planning" and "social welfare", business and state merge into a separate highly centralized power far removed from the real necessities of life and rational ends. This vast power imposes itself as a thoroughly superfluous and impeding weight on society and reacts to it as an autonomous social interest against the emancipation of the productive forces.

The one area where rational economic decisions can be reached—the plant, community and land—is divested of all economic authority. The actual participants in the productive process who know the capacities and properties of the instruments in their hands have no means of bringing real economic problems or—if these "disturb" the interests of competition—methods and inventions for the improvement of production to the attention of society. They can only passively chafe at the waste and destruction to which the fruits of their labor are exposed. The inner voice of the economy which tries from below to speak for release, for a natural expression of its capacities, is silenced by the vast mound of state bureaucratism, laws and profit-motivated owners of this truly social property. "Planning" in the framework of the present system thus amount to nothing more than the ideological deception of the people. And the crassest example of sheer deception is given by Russia with her "spectacular" Five Year Plans, supposed to have led out of the capitalist impasse and to have created a "higher", infinitely "superior" form of society. All that the "Plans" achieved was to *organize the misery* for the perpetuation of precisely the *capitalist* system and its devastating competition which, however, under "control", yields far less for society than when left to itself. Nothing reveals the specifically reactionary character of Stalinist "planning" more than the fact that the rulers of Russia have not even conceived the idea of attracting the large majority of mankind by a *world* plan or of organizing it on the basis of present-day international economic resources. Any attempt in this direction would unmask the Stalinist system and expose Russia as the most barbaric and backward among all capitalist countries.



Never in history has a society obstructed the view of its real wealth and capacities so completely as our bourgeois society, once it had become firmly established. At the time of its inception, the human mind reacted quite differently and was inspired by *possibilities* which it anticipated, while it seems to be totally paralysed by today's directly seizable *realities*. Corresponding with this conversion of orientation, the great Utopias of reason ushered in by the Renaissance received

their impetus from the perspective which the new development opened. For realization they had to rely on the presumed moral and ethical potentialities of man, not on tangible material conditions which could make them more than well-meant schemes.

In the sixteenth century it was nearly impossible even to conceive of a Utopia without slaves, armies, prisons and wars. Men could but think of easing these evils with good intentions and moral fervor. Thus Thomas More frankly acknowledged that an "equalization" of wealth in Britain would only result in poverty for all, and his practical ideas were confined to the mitigation of the horrors visited upon England by early capitalism. Nonetheless, More gave humanity a model of rational social organization *despite* slavery, armies and prisons, in trying to impose the dictates of reason on the narrow material base of his time, while the "planners" of today in the capitals of Europe and America impose models of slavery, armies and prisons on the broad material base of this era, further degrading a society literally suffering from abundance. The early Utopias were models of reason formulated despite profound historical limitations—contemporary "plans" are models of insanity despite unprecedented actualities.

However, the circle of development is closed and the return to reason *on the basis of material realities* a necessity, if our civilization and finally humanity itself are to survive. It is not for nothing that the word "planning" plays such a great rôle in contemporary economic affairs; but if planning is to have any meaning, it must begin precisely on those shores which modern schemes carefully neglect—the *capacities* of the economy. It is necessary to investigate what is and what could be produced, if the social fetters imposed on the economy were removed. A real economic plan thereby involves a dissolution of all "plans" in the present-day sense of the term, for what must be planned is not control of production, i.e. the adaptation of the economy to the prevailing social relations, but the dissolution of these relations and the mechanism of control: the commodity system itself.

In principle there is no difference whether the beginning is made with "over-production" in America or "austerity" in Britain. Just as "over-production", "excess of goods", farm and industrial "surpluses" are catastrophes only in a system of profit, so "austerity programs" to "earn dollars" can be demanded only within the same system, which is paralysed by competition and the stranglehold of the market. But in view of the dominating influence of America and because the fate of humanity in the coming years depends primarily on the further developments in this great continent, the plan which follows is based on the American economy as the most favorable concrete example for a concrete study.

The American economy stands, *circa* 1950, replete, brimming and overflowing with the means of life. Given the near completeness of its resources, the United States provides a mirror for what is available to an integrated world economy where many special problems can be funded into a broad harmonious solution. An economic plan for America, with its extremes of abundance together with waste,

stupidity and technological absurdities illustrating both positive and negative aspects of commodity production, thus represents a more pertinent image of a world plan than a plan for any other region. In addition, because of America's specific weight in the world development, the fruition of a rational system in this dominating section would mean that the "backward" countries will be spared the sufferings of a supervening capitalist development which has brought, besides technology, inconceivable horrors to the advanced and the "backward" regions. The industrial West will *at once* be able to provide the means for a rapidly improving standard of living to the now cruelly oppressed colonial peoples, while gaining for itself the free interchange of needed or desired materials and products in other parts of the world.

Starting from the best features of communal and pre-capitalist forms of society, each individual country and region can be cultivated into a rich flora of variegated social life. With the rise of quality production and creative activity—leaving to mass manufacture only what is really necessary for quantity production—with the establishment of genuine personal intercourse and a true social life, with the elimination of the paralysing extremes in the division of labor prevailing today, and with the easy interchange of occupations, man can develop himself into a rounded human being over a whole lifetime of uncompressed education and experience. With decisions obtained through free deliberation by all the people of small communities, the notion of "freedom" which only exists as something to be gained amidst *unfreedom*, will pass into the limbo of bourgeois prejudices. Indeed, "freedom", "means of life", "leisure" and similar notions cherished in a problematical social system will become the self-evident content of daily life and thus disappear as meaningful terms.

The basis for such a vast transformation is anchored in the economy and technology of our time from which the plan proceeds. Psychological considerations are deliberately left aside as irrelevant for the subject matter. "Human nature" for instance, so avidly discussed today as a datum compounded of "greed", "avarice", "pugnacity", "cruelty", "jealousy", "will to power", etc., has its roots in want, competition and insecurity. Once the system founded on the latter "qualities" is eliminated, the *mores* of capitalism which are so readily exchanged for the term "human nature", the vulgarized and caricatured traits established by psychologists and ideologists, will pass away and with them all predatory aspects of the alleged "human nature".

The purpose of an undeceiving plan, however, is not to prescribe the life of the future or to free mankind from every evil (least of all unavoidable ones), but to uproot those terrible *social* diseases and crimes produced by want and insecurity and which in turn propagate want and insecurity up to a point where they endanger all life on earth. A plan for a rational society must not only show that satisfaction of the basic needs of modern man is possible on the *given* level of production in all branches but that other fundamental problems too are immediately solvable. Our life (and with it that of all fauna and

flora) is threatened not only by "experimental" H-bomb explosions, but also, with the preservation of the present set-up, by the tremendous waste and destruction of our natural resources (there is no essential exception) and by a great number of harmful or directly poisonous production-processes in agriculture and industry, including poisoning of rivers and coasts, of the animals we eat and the air we breathe. In short: If the direct goal of a plan is to satisfy the needs of modern man *with what is at hand under present conditions*, intimately connected with it are the preservation of our resources, the repair of the damage done, the restoration of healthful conditions of life (literally the detoxification of our environment) and production on an enlarged basis.

Quite in defiance of all "planners" afoot today, this goal can be attained without any intervening dictatorship, the least measure of coercion or the slightest personal disadvantage even to the richest.

[*The "Plan" itself was, unfortunately, never completed, Zander having time and again had to abandon his work on it because of more urgent matters.—Ed.*]

REPORT ON THE CAMEROONS*

1. RAPE OF CAMEROONS

Introduction

La Question, published in 1958, revealed the French resort to the use of violence (reminiscent of the Nazis) to elicit information from Algerian prisoners of war. A year later, the publication of *Gangrène* carried the spectre further and showed that such brutalities and torture have not been limited to the scene of war. That, like a cankerworm, it has spread from Algeria to Metropolitan France.

Rape of Cameroons, a translation from the original French text, deals with the same problem of ill-treatment, torture and even barbarism, but in a far wider context than previous publications. Firstly we have tried to present to the world public what goes for French Trusteeship in the Cameroons under the Ahidjo (the Prime Minister) puppet Government. That, contrary to the impression

*First published by the Committee of African Organisations, 200, Gower Street, London, N.W.1., which notes that these statements were issued in Conakry by the Bureau of the Steering Committee, Union of the Populations of the Cameroons, Cameroons Section of the African Democratic Assembly, and translated from the original French text.

France has tried to convey to the world with its almost successful blackout of news over the Cameroons, the present "government" of the Cameroons does not only *not* enjoy the support of the people, but it is entirely maintained by French bayonets. This fact, which has forced the 13,000 French citizens in the Cameroons to make representations, in October, 1959, to the French Government pleading that the world should be informed of the true situation, was earlier accepted by M. Max Clos of the pro-Government newspaper, *Le Figaro*, when he stated in an article—*Upsurge of Terrorism in the Cameroons*—in August, 1959, that "at the present time the fight against terrorism and the protection of the population are almost exclusively assured by soldiers of the French Army and the police from the Métropole".

Secondly, we have endeavoured to make people realise that the present widespread policy of repression and extermination, which has its genesis in the use of violence and torture, both in Vietminh and Algeria, has now taken the better part of Frenchmen (involved in maintaining the French Community), so much so that the pattern of administration throughout the Community is now almost based on a deliberate use of force.

Thirdly, in going further than Mr. Peter Benenson in his introduction to *Gangrène*, we not only reject the use of torture and such archaic barbarisms like public executions but the very basis of both the Algerian war and the dangerous situation created in the Cameroons as a direct result of French colonial and imperial greed. Our purpose is not to argue the case for or against the use of torture to extract information from colonial war prisoners, but to present to the world the real picture of the present state of affairs in the Cameroons under French administration.

And finally, to remind the reader that the solution to the problem of the French Cameroons cannot be separated from the whole problem which has led to the present balkanisation of its people to soothe the whims and caprices of certain imperial powers.



Unlike most African countries, the Cameroons have had the rare but unfortunate experience of three different colonial masters. In the words of one of their leaders, the people of the Cameroons "have been buffeted about in the last three-quarters of a century, by the conflicts, the ambitions, the bargaining, the political philosophies—or should one say civilising European missions, who have always come out solely for the interests of their own countries. The procession has been an interesting one and we have seen with great interest nations bargaining with each other, making peace with each other, making war with each other . . . turning the peoples' governments into puppets and ordering the lives of the Cameroonian people according to their economic theories and blueprints".

In 1885, at the Berlin Conference, or to be more accurate, at the end of the *Scramble for Africa* when partition amongst the European nations was effected without the consent or even consultation of our

peoples, the Cameroons fell under the Germans who ruled her until middle of World War I when she fell to the Allied Forces. Flanked on all sides by the British and French possessions, the two imperial powers took over until the end of hostilities when the newly-formed League of Nations placed the Cameroons under Mandating Status, with France and Britain confirmed as the Administrating Authorities respectively, of 4/5ths and 1/5th of the entire territory.

World War II saw both the end of the League of Nations, and technically, the end of the Mandate. The Mandatory Powers voluntarily placed the territory under the Trusteeship of the United Nations in 1946, but without any physical change in the sphere of influence. From this time onwards, the division of the Cameroonian peoples became more pronounced and more complicated. The end of the war witnessed the beginning of the general clamour for independence throughout the Continent thereby forcing the imperial powers to re-orientate their attitudes towards the mass of our peoples. The British quickly and hypocritically changed their Empire to a Commonwealth of Nations, where the *wealth* is far from being *common* but rather geared to complement that of the Metropolis. The French, with not much taste for duplicity—which respectfully goes for diplomacy—continued with their policy of “integration”; they came out with a crude set-up, called the French Community, which all their colonies and trust territories must either join or become fully independent. A chance successfully taken by Guinea to completely rid herself, and her peoples, of the shackles of colonialism and imperialism.

The 5 million people of the Cameroons—3½ million and 1½ million respectively under French and British administration—without much choice, were forced to dance to the different tunes called by these imperial powers. To appreciate the present position in the Cameroons, we must have a brief analysis of the different trends in the colonial policies of these aforementioned imperial powers. It is now abundantly clear that though there is a difference in international status between a colony and a Trust Territory, the metropolitan administrative policy has always been the same in all these countries.

Let us declare from the outset, and without any equivocation, that contrary to what certain colonial powers would make us believe, colonialism has not changed as regards its purpose. What we are witnessing in the majority of countries where “independence” has been granted is a change in the means of achieving the primary objective correctly described by Lord Frederick Lugard, perhaps the greatest of empire builders, in his *Dual Mandate*:

“It is, moreover, also of great moment that British democracy, faced with problems which portend great changes in our social organisation, should understand the relation which our overseas dependencies bear to the economic well-being of this country—how vital to our industrial life are the products of the tropics, and its markets for our manufacturers.”

How much more true even today? Yes, this was and still is the sole basis of colonialism.



The British, with 1/5th of the Cameroons under their trust, found it very convenient administratively (from their economic, political and military interests), because of the common boundary shared between her Colony and Protectorate of Nigeria, and the Trust Territory, to integrate the two administrations into one of Nigeria and the Cameroons. And from then onwards, the entire history of that part of the Cameroons under the British Government has followed the pattern laid down by the political developments in Nigeria. Regionalism (or, to be more appropriate, Tribalism) which is the political norm of most Nigerian leaders, has inflicted a great blow even on this 1/5th of the Cameroonian people. Today the northern section is now being administered as part of the Northern Region of Nigeria, whilst the remaining southern part has been offered "independence" after it has decided, through a Plebiscite under U.N. supervision, whether it would opt out of the Federation of Nigeria, or join the other part of the Cameroons under the French Trusteeship. Therefore, with Nigeria at the threshold of political independence, the British Trusteeship could be summarised as follows. The northern half must now decide, through a plebiscite—with franchise limited to adult males because, according to the Muslim rulers of northern Nigeria, it would be contrary to the tenets of Islam for women to enjoy the same rights as men—whether they would like to continue under the same administration.* The southern part, which in the past few years had been a region within the Federation of Nigeria, has now, through its leaders, decided to continue under British Trusteeship for another two years when they would be in a better position to make up their minds. Without doubt, there is no more ludicrous situation than this. This leads us to the real subject of the present booklet—the 3½ million Cameroonian people under the French Trusteeship.

The French, with their deep and fervent desire for logic, and consequently more prone to violent reaction, declared for the political and economic integration to the Métropole of their "dependencies". The hollowness of this blatant imperialism dawned on them as a rude shock with their defeat in Indo-China, rapidly followed by the successes of the National Independence Movements of the North African countries. The present heroic struggle of the Algerian peoples, which saw the collapse of the 4th Republic, also witnessed the revision of the idea of "Frenchisation". Integration gave way to the French Community. Indeed a direct political and economic unity gave way to different independent autonomous countries within the French Community. To the French leaders, who are well aware of the fact that their claim to a world power has always been based on their overseas possessions, the present African Movements must be contained. The limit must be within the French Community to which the entire future of France is tied. This explains the emotional and violent outbursts of French politicians at any attempt to make them

*By 2 to 1, they have voted to postpone their decision.

accept the inevitability. They know, and even feel that power is slipping out of their hands. They realise that the Community is still-born. Yet it must be nurtured, caressed and pampered in order to give it an air of reality and life. France must have the H-bomb to establish her claim as a world power. De Gaulle must meet Khrushchev to demonstrate France's inherent right as a world power. And finally, their possessions must be maintained to provide the economic side of the triangle. All opposition—within or outside France—must be crushed or ignored to maintain this world of make-believe.

It is only when this is borne in mind that we can understand the stubborn stand of France to proceed with atomic bomb tests in the Sahara, despite the world-wide protests and the present moves towards world peace. It is only then that we can reconcile France's apparent sabotage of the easing of world tension and the invitation to the Soviet leader. And it is only then that we can realise the deeper meaning of the French Prime Minister's declaration that "Algeria is the soul of France"; that the honour and prestige of France are involved in the Algerian war, that defeat in Algeria is the end to the Community. Every patriot must fight for the honour, prestige and soul of France—the Community. All those that oppose it are enemies of France and must therefore be crushed ruthlessly. You must either fall in line or be trampled underfoot. It is the pursuit of this will-o'-the-wisp of France's already extinct greatness which has led to the present political stalemate both within France and the Community.

We therefore have a curious situation where, in the Cameroons under French Trusteeship, the Ahidjo Government enjoys neither the support of the Cameroonian people nor the sympathy of the entire African Continent as contained in the resolution of the All African People's Conference. Today the Cameroons, to a greater degree than Nyasaland, is a Military State ruled by decrees, where all modern values are brushed aside in a blind and mad desire to maintain the Community. The tragedy of Hola dwindles into insignificance in the face of the public executions which are now common in the Cameroons. Casualties are mounting. The only hope for peace is the recognition of the true representatives of the people as could be determined in free elections, under U.N. supervision.

It is indeed a greater tragedy, that a Republic such as France, founded on the principles of freedom, liberty and fraternity, should end ingloriously crowned with crimes of brutalities, barbarism and torture. Let France, even at this late stage, depart from this disastrous folly which, added to the Algerian war and the impending atomic tests in the Sahara, has worsened the relations between her and the great masses of our people.

London, November, 1959.

Alao Aka Bashorun.

Rape of Cameroons

World public opinion is not fully aware of the cruelty and suppression endured by the people of the Cameroons over the past four years.

It is up to the reader to judge whether France is correctly carrying out the role assigned to her, through the U.N., by the people of the world. France, apparently, has her own interpretation of U.N. Trusteeship, an interpretation which any decent human being will find hard to swallow after reading this brief outline of the democracy and liberty offered to the African. Here you will read how the courageous Cameroonians refuse to submit to the dictates of French colonialists, despite the beatings, tortures and humiliation inflicted upon them.

General Situation

Let us examine the events which occurred in the two main towns of the country, Douala, the largest port, and Yaounde, the capital, in the middle of 1959. This will indicate what is happening throughout the country, particularly in the Mungo and Bamileke regions where the revolution is highly organised. Ahidjo himself, on his return from the 13th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, threatened publicly that he would "burst the abscess"* in these two regions.

But do M. Ahidjo and his puppet Government think they can continually deceive the people of the world through the U.N. where, with his tongue in his cheek he dares to present the situation as being "calm", when he takes extreme measures even to conceal his departures from and arrivals to the country?

Would it not appear then, that free U.N.-supervised elections before "independence" if granted in January, 1960, might well mean that this gallant gentleman (France's version of a good African Prime Minister) would quickly disappear from the scene of a democratically elected government?

Or are the Cameroonians going to have France's rifle-shot democracy: "You have the right to give the correct password, but if you don't know what it is by now it's too bad for you"?

After 40 years of French protection, there is only one lawyer in the Cameroons. The Government has, believe it or not, gone to the extent of promising to set up four Courts of Appeal as a measure of legal reform. But such Courts will be composed entirely of French magistrates, now serving in the Cameroons, who would simply be promoted to higher positions. The Government promised to create a Cameroonian Bar, which in fact would increase the obstacles facing young Cameroonians wishing to enter the legal profession, as time spent under foreign instruction will not always be recognised and they would have to pass an examination under French magistrates in the Cameroons. None of them would be elected by the Law Society, even if they had practised abroad for 10 years, as a candidate would have to have had five years' practice in the Cameroons. Thus, after five years of nominal independence, the Bar will be entirely composed of Frenchmen. This is a direct result of the project outlined by the Cameroonian Ministry of Justice which stipulated that it would be necessary to be French to qualify for the Bar in the Cameroons.

**Presse du Kamerun*, 9-11 May, 1959.

The Ahidjo Government promised administrative reforms and recently selected Cameroonian Prefects and Junior Prefects to carry them out. With French administrators still in control of the Regions and districts, such Prefects are mere figureheads with no power whatsoever.

Every day there are press reports of an attempt being made on someone's life. Even Ahidjo, on his return from Paris where he had talks with General de Gaulle and President Eisenhower, decided to conceal his arrival back home.

At Douala the curfew begins at 9 p.m. Streets are lit all night in Giono. It is impossible to enter the Port of Wouri, near Douala, without carrying a pass. The French Community enforces this curfew by using gunmen especially flown from Tchad, north of the Cameroons.

Bonaberi, a town near Douala, is out of bounds. In 20 out of 22 regions, since the return of Ahidjo from the U.N. on 27th May, civil liberties have been suspended by a Public Order proclamation which gives the French Regional Commissioners the right to arrest anyone who, in their view, is considered a danger to "public security" or, as they put it, to "national unity".

While the situation was presented to the U.N. as "calm", the pro-Government *Presse du Kamerun* gave the following report of activities in Hungo:

"During recent operations six terrorists have been killed. A certain number were wounded and have gone to the British zone for treatment. It is important to note, and to congratulate, those who spared neither time nor pains to help obtain these good results. For a month they have been at the breaches day and night. In particular we must mention M. Charoy of the Security and M. Bepather, a Special Commissioner who paid for his courage with his life, M. Babon, a sergeant in charge of Nkongsamba, M. Rault in Loum, M. Ilazera in Mbanga, M. Ebanda, a postmaster in Melong and M. Cot, Police Commissioner in Nkongsamba."

Five of the seven mentioned as having led the "operations" are members of the French military and police forces. In the same issue, the newspaper published further details of the attempts made on the lives of Sidi Gabriel from Penja, a Government supporter, and a guard at Nkongsamba. At the funeral of M. Bepather, the Police Commissioner killed on the Befang Road, the Government was represented.

Realising the strategic importance of an economic boycott, revolutionary forces, with the full support of the people, block transport of goods. The state of insecurity on the roads leading into Douala itself is so great that at times it is impossible to find basic foods in the Douala markets. As it is no longer safe to travel in the country, road transport drivers have not thought it worthwhile to renew their insurance policies. As a result 100 Cameroonian workers and four French employees are being laid off by the Port authorities.

French magistrates who have become disgusted with the Government's policy asked to be relieved of their posts, despite promotion prospects, so that they could work for the French Government elsewhere. A Government statement of 6th August, in connection with

this move by the French magistrates, was banned from a radio broadcast—as such information was considered “inopportune”. Various dignitaries chosen to sit on the Special Criminal Courts failed to appear when required and had to be heavily fined for not doing so. M. Soppo Priso (a deputy and once a counsellor of the French Union and the brain behind Ahidjo’s policies) when asked whether he was named as a member of a special committee to organise the celebration of the successes of the Ahidjo Government policy, categorically denied any knowledge of it.

Following the demands of the U.P.C.*, the Ministries of Finance and Labour of the Ahidjo Government called for an amnesty and round-table conference. In addition, the Minister of Education and the Vice-President took part in a National Conference of Cameroonian students, under the honorary chairmanship of Dr. Bebey (who was arrested two years ago and whose journal had since been banned), and demanded a round-table conference of the Cameroonian parties, a new government and immediate elections.

Suppression of Basic Freedoms

On his return from the U.N. where he had made promises to re-establish democratic freedoms, Ahidjo had a series of special laws passed by the so-called Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons elected on the authority of the *loi-cadre*, (i.e. Order in Council).

Law 59-31 of 22nd May, 1959 concerns the setting-up of Special Criminal Courts; **laws 59-32, 59-33, 59-34 and 59-35 of 27th May, 1959** alter the laws governing the press, accentuating the arbitrary nature of Article 91 of the French Penal Code defining “attempts against the security of the State”, creating a “state of emergency” and a “state of alert”. In short, this was a means of preventing any appeal to public conscience and any affiliation to political groups.

Law 59-33 concerning “maintenance of order” gives the Minister of the Interior—in the event of “Any dangerous assumptions which could constitute a menace to public order”—the right to proclaim, by a simple decree, a state of emergency in one or more regions of the country. Such a state of emergency would allow French Regional Commissioners to issue orders immediately to arrest any person whom they consider to be a “danger to public security”, and to enforce a curfew. Any breach of these measures could mean 2 years imprisonment, a loss of all civil rights, including paternal rights, and the rights of sojourn.

The state of emergency decreed by the Prime Minister empowers the Regional Commissioners to make the control and purchase of vehicles a matter for the administrative authorities, to establish curfew, and to take measures either to arrest suspects or confine them to their homes.

Even in Algeria, where fighting has been going on for years, emergency laws do not empower the authorities to confine suspects to their homes; they are not as blatant as their counterparts in the Cameroons.

*Union of the Populations of the Cameroons.

Law 59-34 alters and stiffens Article 91 of the French Penal Code, which was severely criticised by French lawyers because of its threat to the freedom of the individual. The Algerian authorities did not find it necessary to change Article 91 which seems to be more than adequate for their indiscriminate persecution and oppression of the Algerian patriots. But Franco-Cameroonian authorities are not so "moderate".

Law 59-35 legalises the seizure of newspapers and the confiscation of their press—a measure which is illegal in France. Censorship is ensured in that proofs, certified as true copies by the publishing manager, must be taken to the Regional Commissioners two hours before publication; in the case of weeklies, four hours. The importation of a French periodical, which has been banned in the Cameroons, can entail imprisonment for one year and a fine of 120,000 francs. In Algeria the press laws have not been so drastically altered.

Law 59-32 forbids any association with a group not "recognised as being of public utility" by the Ahidjo Government. All groups must first have official authorisation from administrative authorities, who alone decide whether their aims would be detrimental to public order. Any infraction of this "law of the Cameroonian State" will be taken as fraud and as an abuse of confidence, and the same penalties will be enforced.

These are the laws that the Government enforced after the last Session of the U.N. They can only be compared to those that existed in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany.

Even a meeting of the General Council of Cameroonian Workers, which was arranged for 25th June, to discuss the work of the International Labour Organisation in Geneva, was banned. Such laws go to the extreme and give full authority to the police to search and ransack houses, in the absence of their inhabitants. The Secretary of the Port Mbong Augustin Union, arrested and then released, was re-arrested after complaining that the police stole 15,000 francs from him at the time of his arrest. The opposition press, *L'Opinion du Kamerun*, run by Dr. Behey (whose equipment was confiscated) and *Kamerun, Mon Pays*, have been silenced. The Cameroonian Committee of the All-African People's Conference has been dissolved. As happened in Algeria, all those accused were placed in prison.

Special Criminal Courts

The setting-up of Special Criminal Courts (law 59-31, 22nd May, 1959) surpasses all others in its effrontery. The result is to legalise oppression and the general use of torture and murder.

This law allows the government, "in the case of repeated disturbances", to establish, by decree, Special Criminal Courts to deal not only with "crimes against the internal security of the state" but also such crimes as "acts of violence, endangering the peace, persons or property, and any related crimes or offences". They can also, on the demand of the Public Minister, carry out immediate sentence for all crimes and offences revealed during the proceedings. The pattern is

therefore an indiscriminate use of penal procedure in these Special Criminal Courts. For instance, the Court of Douala—in the case of the wounding of two drunken Frenchmen involved with prostitutes—sentenced them to a term of imprisonment. However, the Government, through Douala Radio, declared these sentences to be an error and even “promised that no similar error would take place again”. This gives a good idea of what “self-government” and “justice” mean in the Cameroons.

The Special Criminal Courts can openly violate the spirit of the law. The defendants have no right of appeal—as Article 6 states—“Special Criminal Courts will have final judgment without review”. Even in Algeria Military Courts condemned patriots, without much hope it is true, at least have the right of appeal. This concession to legal form has been abolished in the Cameroons, which is certainly the only country today where special judges can condemn men to death without any concern for even the slightest appearance of legality, with their judgment standing without any possibility of appeal or review.

In July, five condemned political prisoners, arrested for activities which took place before the law of 22nd May was passed, were executed in full daylight before the villagers of Bafoussam market. Wounded and dying they were finished off by the police.

In Algeria, patriots have also been killed in public places and their bodies exhibited; but at least there the Government found it necessary to deny these facts. In the Cameroons, M. Ahidjo, “leader of the Government” and M. Torre, French High Commissioner, are not so sensitive. The law gives them authority to massacre patriots in public squares. Under these conditions how could anyone be surprised that the Bamileke region is in a complete state of insurrection.

The Cameroons, in this modern age, stands as the only country in the world, Algeria excepted, where the law provides that “capital punishment will be carried out in public, on the scene of the crime”.

June Events

In Douala, on 24th June, an ex-militant of the U.P.C., Job René Ngapeth, who had joined the Government, was seriously wounded when returning home at about 9.30 p.m. by two shots fired at very close range by a stranger.

On 27th June a group of about fifty men, armed with machettes and clubs, assembled at 7.30 p.m. at the Razel Crossroads in Douala at the end of Edea Road (in Maritime Sanaga, a region supposedly loyal to the Government). For three hours they were parading and singing patriotic songs, and held the road with the support of the local population. Going first to the military camp of Mboppi they raided an arms depot, after killing a French policeman and “lecturing” a Cameroonian guard. (Apart from two guns, none of the arms taken by the people were found.) From there they proceeded to the Frigate Bar favoured by colonists, and then to the Les Portiques cinema in the centre of the residential area. During the various fights which took place, one air force officer and three French civilians were killed.

It was only at 10.30 that the group of young men, going towards the Cantaco nightclub, came up against the "security forces" in a pitched battle with the Cameroonian guards and police, officered by French policemen. It was common knowledge that at the time when action was started the Cameroonian guards had refused to take part and the French had so little confidence in their loyalty that they gave them no ammunition and they had to use their guns as clubs. As a result of these events, all the army and police officers of Douala were arrested and the police were repatriated.

On 5th July, a group of forty young men belonging to the National Liberation Army, armed only with clubs, machettes and one hunting rifle, assembled singing *Cameroons, My Country*.^{*} They went towards the tea room, the Red Donkey, frequented by colonists, owned by a man called Tardivel, known to be a violent racist. During the fighting Tardivel, who carried a pistol, was killed, as was his sister. The young men then went to various European shops, attacked a police car full of policemen and chased the Cameroonian Deputy Commissioner of the Sub-division.

During these events in Douala and Yaounde the population showed its active support for the freedom fighters, most of whom came from the bush nearby. In Douala some of them were housed by inhabitants for many days before the demonstration began. In Yaounde, too, some young men coming from Douala and Mbalmayo were given shelter by the local inhabitants. During the trial in July, the Cameroonian public demonstrated their sympathy with the accused.

On the other hand, the reaction of the "security forces" and the demoralisation of the Cameroonian guards, indicate the isolation of the Ahidjo Government.

The Special Criminal Courts sat at the end of July and the beginning of August in Yaounde and Douala. They showed to what extent and how these special laws can lead to a complete perversion of law. Because of the number of cases brought up before the Special Criminal Courts, and the need for quick proceedings, the rôle of the examining judge became less and less important. The accused, brought before him by policemen who had tortured them, were deprived of lawyers to advise them. Brave men from the countryside, not speaking French and knowing nothing of the French legal system were content (from the time of the first questioning) purely and simply to confirm the "confessions" they had made to the police.

The only evidence submitted came from the police. Although there was adequate time, no alibi was checked, no witness for the defence was heard. The police were more concerned with obtaining confessions than with establishing the truth. That is why, on 30th July, the judges of the Special Criminal Court of Douala noticed with amazement that all the accused, in their confessions, claimed to have killed three people. This was the number the police had fixed to determine when they would stop their torture. The absence of lawyers prolonged detention in police stations; the atmosphere created

^{*}U.P.C. Freedom Song.

by the May laws contributed in the Cameroons, as in Algeria, to the widespread use of torture.

During the trial of 30th July in Doula, the four accused appeared with the still visible signs of the torture to which they had been subjected three weeks before. Tchopladge, Ouwen, and Matik still carried on their backs the scars from being hit with a cowhide whip. Bikoi's arm, which had been broken by blows, was still bandaged, and a fifth man, Dessock, who had been arrested, held and interrogated, was missing. The official story was that he had escaped. Bikoi stated before the court, without any protests from the magistrates, that he had died as a result of torture.

On the basis of the confessions given to the police, the prosecutor asked for five death sentences. The court allowed him two, that of Tchopladge, and of Dessock, who was alleged to have run away. No Algerian court would have dared condemn Audin (General Secretary of the Algerian Trade Union Federation) to death. Matik was acquitted owing to the courageous efforts of his lawyer who proved that he was in Nkongsamba during the Douala events. This proved that his confession was the result of extortion, but no action was taken against the torturers.

At the Special Court of Yaounde, in August, thirty-four men showed the court marks all over their bodies caused by whipping, by hanging from their arms and by electric burns. Etienne Soppo had his left foot in plaster and a large bandage on his hand. Mengue Jean Akoa still had club marks on his face, all his front teeth were broken and some of his side teeth were loose. Mathieu Abeja showed burns on the lower part of his stomach; his sex organ, wrapped in a huge dressing outside his trousers, had been burnt by electricity. When questioned, the Police Captain and the Chief Commissioner stated that "they could not be held responsible for their subordinates".

The prosecutor asked for nine death sentences, but the Court condemned only two. No action was taken against the torturers. Seven of the accused were acquitted, in spite of their confessions. At the second session of the Special Criminal Court in Douala, the Court dismissed the case, because the evidence submitted was incomplete and the manner of bringing the men to trial showed too complete an abuse of power by the police.

Gangrene

The representative of the Government of Guinea, at the August, 1959 Conference of Independent African States in Monrovia, said: "Neither liberty nor independence can be fragmented. The problems will never be solved if we isolate them and apply partial solutions to them. The events which took place in the Congo, still under Belgian rule, in Nyasaland, in the Cameroons and in Algeria, all have the same significance." Events in the Cameroons, the repression there, are not isolated phenomena; they are part of the vast offensive initiated by imperialism, particularly French colonialism, to maintain its domination in our countries. The methods used in the Cameroons

are the same as those used in Algeria and the gangrene is spreading to France and the countries of the Community.

Everybody knows that just as torture is used in Algeria and in the Cameroons (and Minister Malraux admits it himself), torture is used in France today.

In the same way emergency laws were passed in the Cameroons in May, 1959. The Minister of Justice outlined the reasons for a law "tending to strengthen the maintenance of public order", affirming that "at a time when the government is planning certain reforms . . . within the Community, it is essential that any act which might interfere with this programme must be suppressed". Thus in the Ivory Coast, opposition to the Government programme, which would link the country indissolubly to the French Community, becomes a crime against the internal security of the State. As in the Cameroons, Article 91 of the Penal Code has been changed for the worse. The simple act of "discrediting political institutions" or even their "method of functioning" is an offence punishable by a 3-year prison sentence or a fine of 2,500,000 francs. As in the Cameroons, the law governing the press was changed for the worse. A new press offence, endangering public morality, was created.

This was the first step towards establishing Special Courts and torture, as could be seen in the laws governing the press, for cases concerning newspapers are tried summarily. The guilty will be dealt with according to the emergency measures. This was the procedure in the Special Courts in the Cameroons; this was the procedure under which the Malagasy parliamentarians were arrested in 1947. Similar laws were suggested, as we know, by Messrs. Biaggi and de la Malère to the French National Assembly last May, a few hours after the "ultra" counter-revolutionaries murdered the Algerian lawyer, M. Ould Amria, and on the same day that the Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons voted into law the setting-up of Special Courts.

The Government of the 4th Republic, which by an act of sheer piracy arrested Ben Bella in May at the Blanche Airport, was acting no differently from the Governor of the 5th Republic, which had Dr. Raseta, the ex-deputy of Madagascar arrested at Djibouti. Nor was its behaviour any different from the Ivory Coast Government which arrested Professor Memel, an instructor at Conakry Secondary School, abducting him from the plane which was taking him from Accra to Conakry. When the Community becomes a torture chamber for the people, the Africans must refuse to act as assistant executioners. Repression in the Cameroons must not take place with the help of African troops, as happened in Algeria. We all deplore the fact that the troops which guarded Dr. Raseta at Fort-Lamy were those of an African Republic which is a member of the Community.

As the representatives of the Algerian Provisional Government stated at the Conference of the Independent African States, the experience of guided independence in the Cameroons is evidence of the sincerity of French promises as much for Algeria as for all countries of the Community. We must not regard this as a simple coincidence, but as a symbol of the complete solidarity of our people in the fight

for their independence, which cannot be separated from the general fight for democratic freedom and the dignity of man.

The French people must also understand that even under a façade of responsible moderate local leaders, the gangrene which is spreading in the Black Algerias of Africa may be fatal to their own freedom, and to their moral and material interests. It is in the best interest of the French that in achieving independence we should have no cause to resort to arms in the Cameroons. We are not anti-French, we do not intend to expel them from the Cameroons, all we demand is that the French people hold back the arms of the murderers in our country.

* * *

Appendix

AN APPEAL TO WORLD OPINION

UNION OF THE POPULATIONS OF THE CAMEROONS

Cameroonian Section of the African Democratic Rally

BUREAU OF THE LEADING COMMITTEE

Post Box 716 Conakry/Guinea

ON 9TH OCTOBER, 1959, the French Government, through the treachery of their local agent M. Ahmadou Ahidjo, committed the most callous act. Patriots whose only crime was to have fought for the real independence of the Cameroons were brutally executed by French troops in Douala, Yaounde and Dschang. It will be recalled that barely six months ago the same fate was suffered by five patriots: Louis Jounjou, Pierre Simo, Jean Kuetche, Maurice Tchoumbou and Simeon Tabongua.

These shocking murders were committed in the centre of the public square, a thing which could not have happened in any civilised country. They took place a few months after the "independence" of a country where it is claimed that democracy and the basic human freedoms are being respected, and they show the stagnation in the Cameroons and the incapacity of the Ahidjo Government to maintain order in a territory where the Government claims to have the full support of the people. They also prove that the Ahidjo regime is maintaining itself only by a bare thread which is sure to break tomorrow. They prove finally, that in spite of all the clamour of propaganda put out by France, the Cameroonian people, though savagely tortured, is pledged to freeing themselves from the fascist regime that the French Government is forcing upon their country.

Every day that passes proves that we were right last March when we said in the United Nations that M. Ahidjo was simply trying to increase his personal prestige when he gave assurances that he would promote a democratic régime in the Cameroons. History also proves daily that we were equally right last March when we told the international court that the independence France was so "generously" ceding to us was no more than a camouflage for the real intention of the French Government to gradually bring our country into the French Community. Daily events substantiate our warning to all democrats in the world, when we proclaimed that dictatorship was being maintained in the Cameroons by means of bayonets and that all freedom loving people should come to our aid.

And today we see:

- (1) All civil liberties have been suppressed in the Cameroons. It is forbidden for more than two people to walk together and in all the regions of the territory a curfew has been enforced from 5 p.m. All newspapers have been banned, except those which conform to the dictates of the governing powers.

- (2) Although the country has got its nominal autonomy, a few months after, all administrative and economic affairs are still in the hands of French authorities. There are no Cameroonian magistrates, no Cameroonian District Commissioners and there is only one Cameroonian lawyer. Since certain agreements were made between Ahidjo and France, all the aerodromes and ports have now been leased to France for a period of 99 years. Although it is generally thought that a contract cannot be signed between a guardian and his ward, the secret agreements signed by Ahidjo and France mean just this, and will make the "independent" Cameroons a French colony.
- (3) M. Ahidjo allowed the Cameroons to become a part of the European Common Market, which all the African people are against.

All these factors have aroused the indignation of our people. Discontent has also reached the European residential population and even governmental circles. This is the explanation for the resignation of M. Njine, ex-Vice-President of the Ahidjo Government. After having remarked on the unpopularity of their government and the general discontent of the people, M. Michel Njine submitted a detailed confidential report to M. Ahidjo last September. In this report he asked M. Ahidjo to take a courageous stand by negotiating with the U.P.C. in order to bring peace to the country so that by January, 1960 the complete independence of the Cameroons could be realised. M. Njine suggested that prior to negotiation, a total and unconditional amnesty should be declared and that the U.P.C. should be legally re-instated by rescinding the Decree of 13th July, 1955. This report, which was submitted by a member of his party, the Cameroonian Union, was simply brushed aside, because M. Ahidjo received assurances that all measures had been taken to crush the aspirations of the people of the Cameroons by means of force, and without any international guarantee ensuring that this country will not become a part of the French Community. It is appropriate in this respect to deal with two important facts:

- (a) At the secret conference held in Douala on 16th September, 1959, in conjunction with the European population of the area which was attended by the following: Mayor of Douala, Head of the Army, Head of Police, Airforce Commander, Security Chief and the District Commissioner, and all the other administrative heads, M. Ahidjo stated that he was far from altering his opinion, and had no alternative but to maintain it. He called upon all Europeans to remain calm, assuring them that their lives would be protected by the military reinforcements which he expected from the territories of the French Community. He is supposed to have fixed last 1st October as the latest date for the arrival of these troops. He instructed the military commandant to give his soldiers the authority to shoot at suspected persons, without warning. He also assured his audience that with the military bases installed at Manoka, Bonaberi, Penja (Bobe), Dschang and almost throughout the western frontiers of the country, the rebellion would soon be put down. In conclusion, M. Ahidjo declared that "after achieving independence" his government "would assume a military character".*
- (b) The brutal murder of the four young patriots in the public squares of Douala, Yaounde and Dschang took place, as though by accident, the day after the return from Paris of M. Torre, the French High Commissioner.

All the evidence at hand suggests that these barbarous methods have been resorted to, in the Cameroons, with the collusion of the French Government.

And finally, these events must not be dissociated from the fact that the French Delegation alone, when confronted with the grave state of affairs in the Cameroons, opposed the hearing which the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations recently granted the U.P.C. on

*The Times (London, 20th October, 1959) carried the news of the demand of Ahidjo for special powers, which have now been passed after stiff opposition from his hand-picked Assembly.

29th September. It even appears that these public murders, unique in their kind, carried out a few days after the debate in the U.N. on the Cameroons, in which the Cameroons were represented by the French, had been intentionally planned by France in order to demonstrate her contempt for all United Nations decisions.

In view of all these attacks on civil liberties, we issue an appeal to world conscience, to all the progressive organisations, that they should stop the fascists in the Cameroons and ask the U.N. to assume its political responsibilities in a situation which is a human tragedy and could so easily degenerate into a general war. We count on all the people who believe in peace to make sure that this crime ends. Our appeal is especially addressed to the French people, in whose name this massacre is being carried out.

FELIX-ROLAND MOUMIE.*

Conakry, 10th October, 1959.

2. POSITION OF THE "UNION OF THE POPULATIONS OF THE CAMEROONS" ON INDEPENDENCE OF THE CAMEROONS

On January 1st, 1960, after 75 tragic years of colonial domination and exploitation, the Cameroons will achieve independence. This is an event of the utmost significance in an Africa where, contrary to the expectations of the colonial powers, the concept of independence and unity has suddenly become a driving force. The clumsy efforts of the dispossessed colonial powers can at the most slow down this process, but they cannot prevent its inevitable outcome. It is for this reason that this event is of vital political importance to all the countries in Africa, from Cairo to Yaounde, by way of the Cape of Good Hope.

On January 1st, 1960, the people of the Cameroons will witness the realisation of an idea for which they have fought bitterly for many years, under the leadership of the Union of the Populations of the Cameroons. The achievement of Cameroonian independence represents the first victory of the National Movement over the colonial powers and their local agents.

This event is being closely watched by people from all over the African continent, in Asia and throughout the world, and it presents problems of grave concern to anyone who is involved in African affairs. It is, for example, significant that neither in the Cameroons nor in any other part of the continent is there the amount of enthusiasm one would expect to find publicly expressed on such an important historical occasion as the ending of foreign domination in an oppressed country.

This fact is easily explained. It arises from the very conditions leading to independence, conditions which render questionable the actual content of this independence.

The Cameroons is a United Nations Trusteeship and its independence should have been achieved in accordance with the fundamental aims of the United Nations Charter, especially as regards the maintaining of peace and world security. For twelve years the U.P.C.

*Moumie died recently in Switzerland. It is alleged that he was poisoned by agents of the terroristic organisation known as "The Red Hand".

never lost sight of this imperative objective in all the numerous and patient political and diplomatic steps taken by it. All the active members and leaders of the U.P.C. have always been motivated by a sincere desire to find a peaceful and democratic solution to the problem of the Cameroons. Unfortunately these laudable efforts and this sincere desire for honest negotiations, in the interests of all parties concerned, have been interpreted by the colonial powers as a sign of weakness; whereas all objective political observers agree that in spite of the brutal and bloody suppression to which it has been exposed, the National Movement of the Cameroons is now stronger than ever.

Common sense, logic and recognition of the precedence of the interests of the Cameroonian people all point to the fact that on the eve of independence this people should be allowed to decide in whose hands they intend to place the future of their country, now that colonialism has ended. It was in view of this basic principle of democracy that a large majority of the Cameroonian people asked for elections to be held under United Nations control. On March 13th of this year a majority of United Nations delegations, aided by all conceivable and inconceivable pressures from the members of N.A.T.O., opposed this minimal request. By so doing they delivered our people to the mercy of the French agents. During this session the American delegation headed the colonial powers who torpedoed the legitimate aspirations of an African country, against the will of the African delegations. This position taken by the American delegation helps to demonstrate the sheer meaninglessness of the "anti-colonialism" which American leaders unceasingly claim in their speeches. And it especially helps to show the people of Africa what the kind of independence intended for our country is to mean. As in Algeria, the American Government is largely responsible for the war in the Cameroons. Although she dare not mention her name there, America is behind the deaths of the innocent patriots who fall daily under the bullets of the French soldiers.

Who now dares to lift a finger in condemnation of the reaction of the Cameroonian people who have been forced, in desperation, to take up arms in order to resist oppression? This people is now rightfully defending itself. The type of independence which is intended for the Cameroons will be no more than a new kind of colonialism. Our people will continue to be exploited by middle-men, servile intermediaries who have been hand-picked and imposed on the population not because of their devotion to the cause of the people, but rather for the hatred and disdain in which they hold them. The correspondent of an English weekly, *The Observer*, recognised this fact in an article published on December 13th, 1959, on his return from the Cameroons:

The promise of independence to the Cameroons has failed to unite the country behind the new Government.

The reasons are not hard to discover.

The Government to whom the French are transferring power comprises the conservative elements, many of whom vigorously opposed independence in the past.

The article continues:

The forces who fought for independence are either in exile, in the underground or in the opposition. They feel they have been cheated of the fruits of their struggle, which are going to the politicians chosen by the French. This feeling is strengthened by the refusal of the Ahidjo Government to hold elections before independence.

Are those people who have spent most of their time helping the colonialists to keep the people down suddenly going to give up their old loyalties and really serve the best interests of their country? We would be the last to believe it.

The problem of independence remains. For what does the independence of a country mean when the national ports and airports are owned by foreigners, when the Government is not free to adopt foreign policies which take into account the interests of the people and when there are no human freedoms? What does independence mean when the people cannot enjoy democratic rights? When a country is granted independence and its people refused the right of free determination, the only possible outcome is revolution.

The régime in the Cameroons is one of dictatorship. Next January there is to be a referendum on the Constitution of the independent country. This Constitution has already been drawn up by France, a revised edition adapted to the requirements of the moment. Since the men of Yaounde and Paris are quite openly bent on bringing our country into the French colonial empire, any other procedure would have come as a surprise to us.

Neither France nor M. Ahidjo are in any way concerned with the interests of the Cameroonian people, their only concern is the economic future of imperialism in our country. It is therefore understandable that they could not have committed the "imprudence" of entrusting the drawing up of the Constitution to honest Cameroonians, since they would have insisted on the sovereignty of the people and not that of a minority. The fact that the authors of the Constitution were even afraid to submit it to the Assembly in Yaounde provides conclusive proof of its anti-democratic and anti-popular nature.

The debate on the Law of June 4th, 1959, by which France robbed six stretches of land from the Cameroonian people, was very revealing of the effect of popular pressure within the A.C.L.A.M., even among those deputies who had most openly collaborated. After this Ahidjo and France realised the risk they would be taking in submitting to the "elected members" a document designed to guarantee the successful carrying out of their nefarious policies. The "Assembly" was therefore given a holiday so as to allow France and her personal representative in the Cameroons complete freedom to finalise their instrument for the destruction of the Cameroonian people. Nobody is unaware of the fact that Ahidjo is abjectly carrying out policies which have been laid down in Paris. But unlike his master, General de Gaulle, who made some show of consulting the opposers in his Constitution before holding a referendum, this neo-dictator works in the most complete secrecy, and this only a few days before independence. All the precautions and all this stealth demonstrate just how ultra-reactionary this Constitution must be. As far as we know, it is not going to be particularly sympathetic towards nationalists. For

example, anyone who has been imprisoned for political reasons during the time of colonialism is classed as politically incompetent and is therefore not eligible for election. It is not hard to guess the intentions of the authors of this document since at a low estimate, 10,000 patriots are rotting in Cameroonian prisons and concentration camps, at least 15,000 who are exiled in the British Cameroons or elsewhere have been condemned in absentia and therefore become subject to this iniquitous law, and especially since mass arrests of patriots are still taking place. They clearly intend to eliminate all healthy elements in the country and so create the "stable political climate" necessary to enable the imperialists to make the Cameroons the centre of African counter-revolution.

This, broadly, is the gist of this Constitution drawn up by a foreign country on behalf of the independent Cameroons. This is the document that France and her puppet intend to force on the Cameroonian people, as in December, 1956, with the help of the French troops, reinforced by troops from the "Community". They are asking the Cameroonian people to forge the irons which will later be used to burn them alive. M. Ahidjo and his masters are not particularly concerned with the results of this referendum, since it is really only a formality. If his Constitution were rejected, it would in no way prevent our young dictator from carrying out his policies, so tied is he by the commitments he has made in imperialist circles.

Our position is very clear: The present form of independence in no way corresponds to the aims pursued by the U.P.C. from its very inception.

From the first of next January, the Cameroons will enjoy nominal independence. Although independence is the only means by which a people can be fully emancipated, this independence will be a yoke under which our people will be enslaved in their own country by the agents of colonialism and imperialism. They will continue to go naked and to die of hunger in a country where there is a glut of economic resources. Illiteracy will continue to exist. The U.P.C. had intended, after independence, to immediately undertake the colossal task of raising the standard of living of the people, the creators of independence. Such a task could only be undertaken with the effective co-operation of the people and not with the enemies of the people, the colonialists and imperialists. Those leaders who have now been forced on the people receive their orders from abroad and are therefore historically unable to carry out this task. As the conscious avant-garde of Cameroonian nationalism, the U.P.C. would be failing in its mission if it were now to give up the struggle on the grounds that, as some say, now the French Colonialists have left everything will be alright. To begin with, the French colonialists will not "leave" by the door before having made all necessary arrangements for coming back through the window.

Consequently the revolution continues, its aims being as follows:

- 1.) Real independence.
- 2.) The reinstatement of and respect for democratic rights.

- 3.) The land for those who cultivate it, therefore, for the peasants.
- 4.) The well-being of the workers.

It is imperative that all the healthy elements in the country should unite their efforts in order that this programme of the highest national interest should succeed. It is also imperative that all those organisations who are concerned with the fate of the people and workers should find themselves on this revolutionary platform so as to prevent fascism and institute democracy. We should all draw our inspiration from the examples of unity in Iraq, Cuba and elsewhere, which made possible the full success of those revolutions. Every strata of the Cameroonian people should see themselves as being constantly mobilised to bring about the triumphant victory of the aspirations which are now being undermined by the Yaounde clique. It is not a question of *whether* we will win, but rather a question *when* we will win. There is no reason why we should entertain any doubt as to our eventual victory, since we have before us recent examples of peoples, who, after an interminable fight have always finally managed to rid themselves of all those imperialist elements who are enstated in their countries under the guise of leaders. Eight years of struggle in Indo-China, twenty in Iraq, five in Cuba. These provide sufficient example to enable us to continue our revolution and to view the future with optimism.

Everything Depends On Our Determination

During the heroic fight for the recognition of independence the Cameroonian people have gained a great deal of sympathy. In thanking those States and organisations working for peace, freedom and justice for their unfailing support, we hope that they will continue to stand by us in this second phase of our revolution.

We wish, in particular, to appeal to all African leaders, trade unionists and organisations to support the just cause of the Cameroonian people. All problems in Africa are today so completely inter-dependent that what takes place in any one territory of our continent should not leave any African indifferent. If the fascism against which the Cameroonian people are fighting were to succeed, those who are involved would not hesitate to extend their field of activities.

The Cameroonian people do not judge African leaders from their stated intentions, but only on the basis of their positive actions on behalf of the revolution. This people will not forget that leaders like Senghor are to a large extent responsible for the deterioration of the situation in their country.

Sooner or later the Cameroonian people will have the last word.

Conakry, Guinea

December 29th, 1959.

FELIX-ROLAND MOUMIE,
President, U.P.C.

ERNEST OUANDIE,
Vice-President, U.P.C.

ABEL KINGUE,
Vice-President, U.P.C.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION IN THE FRENCH-DOMINATED "REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON"

A Glance at Ahidjo's Neo-Colonialist Republic

In March, 1959, the United Nations, on the occasion of the important Special Session on the problem of the Cameroons, ignored the almost unanimous stand taken by the African States and decided to grant independence to the Cameroons prior to holding general elections. Since then it is impossible to believe in the good "anti-colonialist" intentions of the Government of the United States of America.

During that Special Session the Government of the U.S.A., in the eyes of all conscious and honest Africans, showed that as the leader of intercontinental capitalism, the U.S. could not afford to hinder itself with any considerations of human justice, equity of freedom, that the prime concern of Washington is to ensure the meaningless extension of the tentacles of imperialism, even in its most distant strongholds.

So what does it matter that the brave Cameroonian people, bound hand and foot, are being delivered to the puppet Ahidjo? What does it matter that Cameroonian patriots are still being massacred by mercenaries in the pay of Paris? However, what is more important, is that now we are able to see through the demagogic statements of the imperialist States. Nothing they can offer, however attractive, will have any effect on the Cameroonian people who are resolutely engaged in the struggle which will inevitably end in independence and a decent life for all.

In the daily analysis we make of events in our country, we recently pointed out certain changes in the behaviour of the imperialist beast, now that it is at bay, and we also explained the significance of the new methods employed by the imperialists to protect their privileges. We denounced their present tendency of "giving" independence to their colonies so as to undermine the revolutionary spirit of the people. These neo-colonialist tactics are exemplified in the tragic comedy now being performed in the Cameroons, and all the grotesque buffoonery of Ahmadou Ahidjo will never conceal the bloody episodes of the past weeks.

In the January, 1960, issue of *Démocratie Nouvelle*, Albert-Paul Lentin writes, and justifiably, that:

The traditional methods of Anglo-American capitalism are "neo-colonialist". British Governments, in particular, have mastered this game which consists in handing over certain political attributes of sovereignty to a class of leaders from the countries they have colonised, while maintaining and even increasing their domination over these countries, *with the support of its "protégée" bourgeoisie*. Having been brought into this game of competition and outbidding with Anglo-American and German capitalism, French capitalism, threatened with almost complete annihilation, was forced to adopt the same weapons and adapt itself to more modern and flexible methods than the old type of direct administration. This "intelligent" game is all the more easy for them, since they do not come into conflict with the

interests of agricultural feudalism or those of a large colony of European settlers.

The de Gaulle Government has championed this new colonial policy which Jacquinot described somewhat cynically at the Special Session of the U.N. last March, when he stated that the countries which are today considered colonialist, are forced to adopt a pretence of anti-colonialism.

De Gaulle is now forced, or at least to take into account, if not to understand, the absolute determination of the Cameroonian people to achieve full independence. If the General-President prefers the term "international sovereignty" to that of "independence", which undoubtedly reminds him of the snub received from Conakry in 1958, it is no less significant that he has "put a great deal of water into his wine" since the referendum-plebiscite, at least as regards his colonial policies.

His speech in Saint-Louis, when he recognised the right of Mali to independence, was a real piece of histrionics. This was followed by negotiations between France and Mali and France and Madagascar which revealed the vital need to revise Section XII of the de Gaulle Constitution. For the existing Article 86 of the Constitution does not permit any State to remain within the "Community" once it achieves independence. Therefore, to be really realistic, Article 86 should henceforth express exactly the opposite of its present content. In the interesting article we have already quoted, Albert-Paul Lentin states:

In order to make such radical changes in the text, de Gaulle can make use of the expressly provided revision procedure in the Constitution; the Parliamentary vote (both National Assembly and the Senate) followed by a vote of the Community Senate.

By that date (April-May, 1960) according to Gaullist plans, the "Community" will have taken on a new form (but for how long?) and will be able to invite membership of new independent States, in addition to Mali and Madagascar, for example, Togoland and the Cameroons.

If we quote Lentin at such length, it is because we want our comrades to appreciate fully the neo-colonialist mentality displayed when Ahidjo, with a great deal of fuss and noise, was put into power:

At the present moment all political action on the part of the French authorities in the Cameroons, must be seen within this context. The six-month agreements between France and the Cameroons—independent since January 1st, 1960—give the administration and the French military forces still sufficient time on the spot to help the "Francophile" Prime Minister Ahidjo hold "good elections" from which a "good government" would result. That is to say, a government capable of dragging the Cameroons into the wake of de Gaulle's new policies, thus joining the "Community" in the new way.

All this is very clearly put. What is more, Lentin's speculations are now confirmed by facts.

Mali and Madagascar are achieving "international sovereignty" after concluding agreements with Paris on substantial military and economic co-operation. As for the Cameroons, the Gaullist octopus is patiently lying in wait for that country. In the meantime, loyal Bao Dai, whose education has been judiciously cared for, *proclaimed independence and had it adopted* in conditions which do credit to the

political maturity of the Cameroonian people — the “Republican” Constitution, which even on the basis of a very scant analysis is quite obviously reactionary and thoroughly undemocratic.

The Constitution of March 4th, 1960, institutes a Government in the Cameroons more despotic than almost any other Government in the world. The powers given to Ahidjo are in some respects even greater than those provided by the French Constitution for its General-President. In the realm of civil law, it is a presidential regime of a very particular nature, since the prerogatives of the President are reminiscent of those assumed by the kings who maintained their position by virtue of a supposedly divine right.

Before examining this Constitution—engineered for the purpose of crushing a people who legitimately aspire for democracy—it would be useful to make a general analysis of classical examples of presidential governments in order to show up the completely despotic character of Ahidjo’s institutions.

Every State is necessarily authoritarian in the etymological sense of the word, since the word “State”, according to the definition given to it by Civil Law theoreticians, means “institutional power”. That is to say, the State exercises power on behalf of the citizens of a nation, power that each one of them possesses according to the natural law whereby every man is entitled to protect himself from despotism and every form of injustice. For men who live in societies cannot continue to make justice the responsibility of either the individual or the restricted group. The State is evolved to undertake these serious responsibilities and to put them into practice on behalf of all citizens. It is quite apparent that the merits of State control are entirely dependent on the most fundamental character of each particular State. A distinction can therefore be made between, on the one hand, autocratic States which are usually despotic and dictatorial, and, on the other hand, democratic States which are supposed to represent and interpret the wishes of the greatest number.

It is difficult to find examples of democratic and autocratic States in their pure form, since most modern tyrants and despots continually hide behind a pleasing cloak of democracy. They oppress and tyrannise the people whom they claim to represent and on whose behalf they exercise their usurped power, often gained through bloodshed.

Presidential Government is essentially democratic, since the President is elected by the people. Therefore, the fact of achieving power on the basis of popular support invests any such President with far more authority than even legal authority, if the President has a great deal of personality. This happened frequently in the United States. It was hoped to find a way of modifying this system by restricting the presidential electoral body and removing it several stages from the actual popular vote.

Ahidjo’s Constitution has established a dictatorial presidential regime in the Cameroons and its fraudulent nature is quite apparent under the thin veneer of democracy.

While insisting on the non-religious character of the Republic, the

preamble of Ahidjo's Constitution nevertheless puts the people under God's protection.

The independent and sovereign Cameroonian people, placing themselves under the protection of God, proclaim that mankind has inalienable and sacred rights, irrespective of race, religion, sex or creed.

May God rid this people of its parasites as soon as possible through an overwhelming victory of the oppressed over the imperialists.

Let us now examine the very essence of the Constitution. Again in the preamble we find, "freedom and security are guaranteed to all through respect for the rights of others and for the superior interests of the State". There could not be a more clear denial of individual freedom. And since "the superior interests of the State" are always in opposition to those of the people, it is easy to imagine the exactions that will be imposed on Cameroonian patriots until the inevitable victory that is already in sight.

Further on in the preamble we read:

Every man is entitled to reside where he wishes and to move freely within the limits of the legal restrictions necessary for the requirements of public order and health.

One is astounded by the similarity between certain legal dispensations applied in the Union of South Africa, where freedom of circulation is officially allowed to Negroes "within the limits of certain restrictions". There, too, as though by coincidence, these restrictions, not to say interdictions, are also concerned with "public order and health". We know that public order and health in South Africa do not suffer when Negroes from the bush settle in certain urban centres for long periods. It is quite possible to assume that Ahidjo's public order and health will not tolerate the presence of Cameroonian patriots in certain centres. But even if Ahidjo were to surround himself with an even higher and thicker barrage of laws, the last word would still come from the people who are fighting.

The preamble further informs us that:

No man can be persecuted for reasons of origin, opinions, religious, philosophical or political beliefs, provided these do not endanger public order.

And further on:

Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of association and freedom to form trade unions and strike are all guaranteed within the conditions established by the law.

In other words, all basic rights, such as freedom of belief, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and so forth can only be guaranteed to the Cameroonian people within a restrictive framework arbitrarily defined by the law. Generally speaking, of course, individual freedom must always be limited if all men are to be free and in every country in the world the concept of public order is a safeguard against anarchy. But what is most remarkable about Ahidjo's Constitution is the fact that he actually recognises the basic rights of all men, but on every occasion he circumscribes them with the addition of legal dispensations. This is not done for the purpose of reassuring those who are fighting against the present Government, or even those who might come to change their point of view and favour a more liberal and democratic régime.

Section I of the Constitution deals with the question of sovereignty, and we quote the second to last paragraph of Article 1:

"The motto of the country is 'Peace, Work and Homeland'."

When this Constitution was submitted to the people its author no doubt overlooked the fact that the Cameroons was far from experiencing peace, the first word in the motto. He also must have overlooked the fact that the country is being torn asunder, that foreign troops are fighting our patriots and that the Republic's motto is soaked with the blood of Cameroonians who are sacrificing themselves in order that the free and independent Cameroons should really experience peace, work and the true interpretation of the word "homeland". This word should become a word meaning peace, a serene word, living up to the high integrity of those who have fought for a true "homeland".

Section III deals at great lengths with the powers and functions of the President. Article 14 states:

The President of the Republic, when circumstances so demand, can declare a state of emergency by a presidential decree taken in the Council of Ministers, allowing the Government special powers in circumstances prescribed by the law which will deal with this matter.

Thus the Constitution gives the President the right to declare a state of emergency and confers special powers upon him by a simple Government act, and it states that these fantastic powers are to be established by a law which does not as yet exist. Anyway, it is remarkable that the first paragraph of Article 20 gives the President the uncontested right to give himself special powers by a mere Government act, that is to say, according to his wish.

Section 4 is much briefer than the preceding one, since it contains only two articles, the first of which, Article 1, states:

The Government ensures management of the affairs of the Republic, the Prime Minister, the leader of the Government, directs all action.

In exceptional cases he can deputise for the President of the Republic in presiding over the Council of Ministers, when expressly delegated to do so on the basis of a determined agenda.

It is therefore clear that this Prime Minister is nothing more than a handyman. Because, if for any reason the President of the Republic is prevented from presiding over the Council of Ministers, however long his period of unavailability, the Prime Minister, whose position as general manager seems to be acknowledged, is enabled by the Constitution to lead the Government "effectively", since if he replaces the President of the Republic at the head of his Council of Ministers in exceptional circumstances, he can only do so when *expressly delegated to and on the basis of a determined agenda*. In other words, if the President of the Republic is ill, the Prime Minister has first to travel to see him, obtain his authority to hold a Council of Ministers and then ask the President to draw up an agenda for him. Any statement or decision on the part of the Council of Ministers which falls outside the agenda would be illegal since it would be unconstitutional. But this is not all; Ahidjo intends to make sure that he is well protected: Section V, regarding the relations between the National Assembly and the Government, Article 24, states:

Matters outside the scope of the law come under the jurisdiction of statutory law.

Any legislative documents on these matters which came into being before the present Constitution can be changed by decree.

The powers of the Cameroonian President of the Republic are unlimited. By simple decree he can legislate, make new laws or change the old ones. This then is the rule of a political opportunist who thinks he is protecting himself but who is aware of the fundamental laws of the development of peoples. For present events in Africa are moving at an unforeseen pace. The Constitution, which should not normally have been drawn up on behalf of one man, or a few men, but for the country and its people, will soon be rendered obsolete by events. The real sovereign Constitution will be proclaimed by the free people of the Cameroons and there will be no need to confer anti-democratic powers to a President of the Republic, because the President will not be elected by a restricted electoral body, but proudly enstated by universal suffrage. For after sweeping away all the mercenaries and agents of the imperialists, the people will have found a new path in democracy.

Article 35 gives the President of the Republic the right to dissolve the Assembly every time it does not behave itself, that is to say, every time there is a conflict of any kind between the Assembly and the Government. Of course, the same Article states that in the case of such conflicts persisting, the Government will be dismissed. But this is not the most characteristic aspect of the document. What is more outstanding is the fact that in the eventuality of the President deciding to dissolve the National Assembly, he has only to carry with him his old government team which would remain loyal to him and oppose the Assembly, which would have disappeared due to the extraordinary powers of the President of the Republic.

Such powers, in the hands of a man like Ahidjo, will create a whole army of deputies and ministers, flitting about, resigning, being dismissed on all sides, according to the caprices, if not the mental summersaults, of the little despot.

Ahidjo goes yet further. Article 48, Section 10, on local organisation, stipulates:

The General Council in the provinces is made up of elected or nominated counsellors according to the conditions stipulated by the law. The same is true of deputies to the National Assembly elected in the provinces.

One can hardly believe one's eyes when reading some of the dispensations of this Constitution, because, in the final analysis, what is the use of a General Council if it is only formed in order to give one man the right of nominating members?

Because, by definition, these members should only have power by virtue of having been elected by the people, and a General Council representing the legislative, in addition to agents of the executive, should help in distributing power. It is quite true that everything about the Constitution and everything about the conferring of absolute power on Ahidjo—how short-lived these will prove—shows a complete flaunting of principle. All that is intended is that the regime and the man should last as long as possible.

Since tyranny and despotism also have their logic a monstrous electoral law came into being in order to ensure the implementation of the reactionary Constitution. This electoral law is very detailed and as for its definition of electoral rights and eligibility, its conditions are completely inadmissible. Thus one finds an unduly severe dispensation in Article 17 of the electoral law of 4/3/60:

Article 17: Voters cannot be inscribed on the electoral list within a period of five years from the date their sentence became effective, persons who have been sentenced either for an offence as described in Article 16 (30) or to a prison sentence without a stay of proceedings equal to or longer than one month or less than or equal to three months, or to a prison sentence with a stay of proceedings equal to or longer than six months or for any offence without a stay of proceedings with a fine higher than 150,000 francs without prejudice to the dispensations of Article 18.

In all events, the Tribunals by passing sentences described in the preceding paragraph can absolve sentenced persons from their temporary suspension of voting and electoral rights.

Without prejudice to the dispensations of Article 16 and of the first paragraph of this article, must not be inscribed on the electoral list during a period established by the judgement, all those who have been forbidden the right to vote by the Tribunals.

In addition to the fact that the first paragraph of Article 17 ordains a withdrawal of electoral rights for people sentenced with a stay of proceedings, one is amazed to discover in paragraph 2 that the Tribunals, in passing these sentences, can absolve sentenced persons from this temporary suspension of voting and electoral rights. This can only mean that the courts are allowed extraordinary powers to discriminate arbitrarily between citizens subject to the same penalties, or rather, citizens sentenced to the same penalties. This discrimination permits the Tribunals to absolve one citizen from not being allowed to vote whereas they can pronounce another man unqualified if his face displeases them. In no other country can such brutal electoral laws be found. Ahidjo and the magistrates who hold position by grace of him have the right to decide that such and such a Cameroonian citizen can enjoy his civil rights, whereas another one cannot vote, even if he is in the dock for offences which have been committed in collaboration with other citizens who are in the good books of the Government. Another remarkable dispensation of this electoral law is that of the last paragraph but one of Article 26, which states:

The work of the Electoral Commission can only validly be carried out by one of its members, as long as all the members are informed of this work before the Commission closes.

This concerns the Annual Revision Commission for the electoral lists, where one member of this Commission is able to meet (so to speak), undertakes the work, continues with it, crosses out names of electors, writes in others, and all this with only one obligation, that of informing the other members, not when the Commission opens, but before it closes. That is to say, an ordinary civil servant can inscribe or cross out citizens' names from the electoral lists, so long as a few days before the work ends he informs the other members of the Commission, who have intentionally been kept in ignorance of his

work. And the elections themselves are rigged in advance and cannot even be said to have been cleverly falsified.

Further, Article 27 makes it possible for the same Annual Revision Committee to cut the electoral lists.

Those who have lost the prerequisites required by law, *even if their inscription has not been questioned.*

Crossing out what you do not like, writing in what is favourable to you, here then is Ahidjo's democracy. The same Article 27 lists among those citizens who can be crossed off the lists—"Those who have been unduly inscribed".

No further comment is needed!

Election propaganda was not neglected in the electoral law. That was to be expected. Article 27 states:

Two copies of the texts of circulars, statements of policy and posters must be submitted for the endorsement of the Prefect and the Minister of the Interior. One copy is kept for the archives, and the other, with the endorsement, will be returned to the candidate. The endorsement will be mentioned in the printed document.

This endorsement will be refused for any text which constitutes an appeal for violence, subversion, or that which incites hatred against any authority or group of citizens.

This is the old story of the wolf and the lamb—the endorsement is refused to any candidate who does not show that he supports the authorities. Speaking of an appeal for violence or subversion or inciting hatred against an authority or a group of citizens in an election campaign, gives the impression that the authorities, in taking all these precautions, have a bad conscience, or that in any event they are far from feeling sure of the support of the people on whose behalf they claim to be legislating.

Let us now take a look at the actual conditions of voting. Voting Commissions are set up and these Commissions have a great deal of power. Article 86 states:

If the number of delegates designated by the candidates is less than four, or if one or any of these delegates is absent at the polling, the President of the Commission, by a decision to be entered in the Minutes, must nominate electors inscribed on the list corresponding to the Voting Bureau.

And Article 88:

The delegates of candidates who are not present at the opening of the polling and who have been replaced by the President under the stipulations of Article 86, cannot claim to be sitting on the Commission or exercise control over elections.

Too bad for the unlucky candidates whose delegates arrive late, who would no longer have any control and everything would be finished before he had time to say a word.

If democracy has its logic, so despotism also has its logic, as we have previously stated. It is quite understandable, though in no way justifiable, that the puppet Ahidjo, on the advice of his masters, should have to resort to dictatorship. It is not even certain whether it can be called dictatorship, because his behaviour in fact surpasses any-

thing conceivable, since Ahidjo uses the most flagrant despotism to maintain power against the will of the people. In the addendum at the end of this analysis, we give extracts from a very interesting article which appeared in an edition of *Echos d'Afrique Noire* giving an extraordinarily clear prediction of the election campaign and of the votes which will be cast in the Cameroons on April 10th.

Article 121:

Anyone reporting slanderous rumours or attempting to defraud in order to turn away voters, or causing one or more voters to abstain from voting, will be punished by imprisonment ranging from one month to one year and by a fine of from 18,000 to 360,000 francs.

Article 129:

Whosoever, through gifts or liberalities in money or in kind, through promises of gifts, favours, public or private employment or any other advantages given with the intention of influencing the vote of one or more electors, has obtained or attempted to obtain their votes, either directly or through an intermediary, whosoever, by the same means, has caused anyone to abstain will be punished with from 3 months to 2 years imprisonment and by a fine of from 90,000 to 900,000 francs.

One is immediately alarmed to see that such heavy penalties are provided for people who attempt to persuade an elector to abstain. It is already somewhat difficult to prove that someone has been made to abstain, and even more difficult to establish a mere attempt to commit such an offence. It would therefore appear that Ahidjo's Government is particularly afraid of abstentions, since it can offer no other method of encouraging enthusiastic citizens to carry out their civil responsibilities.

Finally, and this caps all, we find in the final dispensations:

Article 135: "The methods of applying this ordinance will be established by a Decree."

The meaning of this statement is quite clear. Penalties have been prescribed, ambiguous offences described and qualified, but the decisions as to whether an offence has or has not been committed, and the circumstances of application or non-application of the penal law, will be left to the discretionary power of the Government, since these will be established by decree, according to the circumstances. Here is a perfect example of oppression. Ahidjo is worried and he should think a while of the fate suffered by the despicable Glaoui and by Bao Dai. He should realise that he is not deceiving the people, he is only deceiving himself. If he wants to impose himself on the people by means of foreign arms, he will not last long. In all likelihood he will disappear long before colonialism has been totally abolished, because tyrants usually drown themselves in the very blood they cause to flow all around them.

Ahidjo says to himself "Après moi le déluge" (The deluge will come after me). "I am in a wonderful position and I am exploiting it to the full." But he should beware of being swept away by the deluge.

Conakry, 9th April, 1960

FELIX-ROLAND MOUMIE,
President, U.P.C.

ABEL KINGUE

ERNEST OUANDIE
Vice Presidents of the U.P.C.

Addendum

We give below long extracts from an article entitled "The Cameroonian Elections" by Hervé Montant in the *Echos d'Afrique Noire* of April 9th, 1960:

The second polling since independence in the Cameroons, for the election of 100 deputies to the National Assembly, will take place on April 10th, 1960. We all hope that this time the same methods of distorting public opinion as were used during the referendum of last February 21st will not be applied.

The election campaign has been under way for too short a time and there are too many candidates to make it possible as yet to speculate on the outcome. There are, however, districts where voters have no need to go to the ballot boxes, since the candidates there can already consider to have been elected. These are the Northern districts, where only men in favour of the Government have been allowed to stand and all other lists have been discarded. Thus from Fort Foureau to Ngaoundere, there is not one contested list.

In the South, on the other hand, the Head of the Government attempted to use tribalism as a weapon against the opposition. So that although the only polling system in the North is that of electing members from a list, all kinds of devious methods were practised to introduce constituency polling in the areas which had returned a high percentage of "No's" at the referendum. Thus, in many areas in the South, the electoral wards were sometimes nothing more than clans, if not families. The main reason for the electoral system applied was to make sure that supporters of the regime should be elected in that part of the country.

Therefore, to ensure the defeat of two very clear-sighted members of the opposition, Mr. Soppo Priso and Dr. B. Ebey Eyidi, it was thought necessary to put the district Chiefs Akwa and Bell in opposition to them. One of these Chiefs is a Minister of State and the other is the famous Prince Douala Manga Bell who is well known for his frivolous activities in Paris high society.

The prefectural and municipal authorities, of course, do not conceal their support for these two tools of the Government, or for the Government itself. All the municipal cars and civil servants were therefore put into action for the propaganda campaign of these two excellencies. The national radio network, for its part, undertook to open this campaign on the pretext of evoking past history of the Cameroons and acclaiming the patriotic acts of the Bell and Akwa "kings".

Prince Bell himself, who alternated between German citizenship at the time of the German protectorate and French nationality during the trusteeship, has just been admitted to Cameroonian nationality with retrospective effects. This act, which was only carried out in order to make his nomination acceptable, was contrary to the dispensations of the Code concerning Cameroonian nationality.

If the régime is sure of carrying with it supporters in the North, and even of increasing their numbers, the same is not true of the South, where these ministers and parliamentarians who advocated "Yes" votes at the referendum are in serious election trouble. Some get away with it, but only owing to the amount of corruption being practised, despite the strict regulations of the law. In the most unconcerned way they are holding numerous official receptions, decorating ceremonies, inaugurations and "cocktails at the palace".

One thing is certain: all the candidates in the South are asking for

these procedures to be reversed and are unreservedly condemning the Government's action. Every candidate's statement of policy denounces it vehemently.

This is very important, considering the vital necessity of changing the political situation in the country. The elected members must not disavow their beliefs. The leaders must make sure that these changes occur peacefully and that change is not sought in violent revolution, which might easily happen if the present methods persist.

*

*

*

Press Release

12th May, 1960

Information has reached the Committee of African Organisations from reliable sources that there is now a military censorship in the Republic of Cameroon and that a division of French troops has been moved from Algeria to the Cameroon. Reports state that French planes have carried out continuous bombing in the Bamileke Region during the past week. Over 500 arrests have been made in Bamenda and more than 500 women and children have been deported from that region.

Fears that Cameroon is being turned into another Algeria are confirmed. The present régime, upheld by French imperialism, is causing the Cameroonian people untold suffering, terror and bloodshed.

We call on all peace-loving peoples to draw to the attention of the forthcoming Summit Meeting in Paris the deliberate attempts of France to sabotage the peace of the world, and demand the immediate withdrawal of French troops from African soil.

Segregation—Humanitarian Style

LONDON, 20th February—Field Marshal Viscount Slim, former Governor General of Australia, said today that he was in favor of "keeping Australia white."

The Field Marshal, who was addressing members of the Insurance Institute of London, said he knew "dozens of Indians and Pakistanis who are better educated, much cleverer, have a much higher standard of integrity and thousands who are braver than I am." Therefore, he said, he doesn't want any of them to go to Australia and become "second-class citizens." (*New York Times*, 21st February, 1961.)

SLAUGHTER

of British wild life by

DIELDRIN

and other poisons

used as seed dressings to protect crops from certain fungi and insect pests has resulted in the British countryside's during the spring sowings being described as "like a battlefield"—littered with the corpses of birds and animals which have eaten the seed or other poisoned creatures.

The possible dangers to human health and life are self-evident. Less immediately evident, but more far-reaching, is the longer-term danger of distorting the whole ecological balance.

Contemporary Issues has long concerned itself with the dangers of using chemicals in food production. Back numbers contain, amongst others, the following:

No.	Title	Author
12	The Problem of Chemicals in Food	L. Herber
36	A Protest against the Aerial Spraying of Dieldrin	M. Nice
21	A Follow up on the Problem of Chemicals in Food	L. Herber
26	The Fluoridation Experiment	M. Klerer
28	Reactions to "The Fluoridation Experiment" in England	N. Parker
35	The Preservation of Foods by Irradiation	Alex Scher
39	A Fragment on Chemicals in Food and Other Questions	E. Zander
5	The Great Utopia (Section 7)	E. Zander

Some of the above are in short supply and we may not be able to meet all demands.

FURTHER MATERIAL IS TO HAND AND
WILL BE PUBLISHED SHORTLY

The Works of Joseph Weber published in previous numbers of
Contemporary Issues, under the pseudonyms:

Ernst Zander

Germany and World Development	No. 1
Interim Balance Sheet: The Bankruptcy of Power Politics	No. 4
The Great Utopia—Plan for the Organisation of a World Democratic Movement	No. 5
War as a Way Out?	No. 7
Majority and Minority (Discussions on "The Great Utopia")	No. 10
The Case of Puerto Rico	No. 18
The Campaign Against Remilitarisation in Germany	Nos. 23 & 27
Comments	No. 24
Reflections on "Reflections"	No. 37
An Unfinished Letter	No. 38
On Chemicals in Food and Other Questions	No. 39

Wilhelm Lunen

Appeal for an English Edition of Diderot's "Jack the Fatalist"	No. 15
The Ring of the Nibelung	No. 19
The Problem of Social Consciousness in Our Time	No. 31

Erik Erikson

Critical Revue (with Cobbett and Heine)	No. 5
Critical Revue—New York Eriksonised	No. 7
The Dog Behind the Stove	No. 9
Critical Review of "The Dog Behind the Stove"	No. 9
Critical Revue on Doctor Faustus— Prologue in The Heaven of Art	No. 24